THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THERE are certain times when the best thing that a man can do is to pause and to take stock of himself and of his work, to set before himself the ideal of what he is trying to do, and to evaluate his actual practice, performance and achievement in the light of that ideal. In no sphere is that more necessary than in the life of the Church. Dr. H. Richard NIEBUHR in *The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry : Reflections on the Aims of Theological Education* [1] has provided us with the challenge to rethink our task, and with an analysis of the ideal of that task.

The raw material of this book has been provided by the voluntary self-examination of more than one hundred American theological schools. The reason for the book is that, as Plato said long ago, 'the unexamined life is not worth living'. 'It is said that an uninspected army deteriorates and this is doubtless true of all human organizations. We tend to repeat customary actions unaware that when we do to-day what we did yesterday we actually do something different since in the interval both we and our environment have changed; unaware also that we now do without conscious definition of purpose and method what was done yesterday with specific ends in view and by relatively precise means. Education in general, and not least ecclesiastical education, is subject to this constant process of deterioration and hence in need of periodic self-examination.' Here, then, is the material and the genesis of this book. It is with the earlier half of the book, its examination of the Church and its purpose, that we are here mainly interested and concerned.

One of the obvious dangers of the Church is that we should think and act in terms of denomination rather than in terms of Church. And yet it is clear that, however imperfectly the ideal is carried out, the vision of many schools goes far beyond the horizons of the denomination. Here are some of the aims in which different theological schools defined their objectives—spreading and deepening the influence of Christianity, promoting the interest of religion and morals, training Christian leaders who are whole-heartedly committed to Jesus Christ and able to share His gospel in all its relevance through the Church and all the agencies of God's Kingdom; to provide leaders capable of bringing to others the saving knowledge of God in Jesus Christ, training leaders competent in this age to interpret truth and to direct activities of the Church in its related institutions at home and abroad, the preparation of men for the ministry of the Word and the sacraments. Here are aims which look far beyond mere denominational boundaries.

Dr. NIEBUHR sees the Church in a series of 'polar' terms, a series of antitheses, which are not contradictory but complementary. (1) The Church is 'the subjective pole of the objective rule of God'. The Church is no more the Kingdom of God than natural science is Nature. 'It is the subject that apprehends its object; that thinks the Other; worships and depends on It; imitates It perhaps; sometimes reflects It; but is always distinct from its Object.' This means on the negative side that the Church is not itself the Kingdom; on the positive side that there is no apprehension of the Kingdom except within the Church; that wherever there is such apprehension of the object the Church there exists; and that the subject-counterpart of the Kingdom is never an individual in isolation but an individual in community. (2) This will mean that the Church must be defined in terms of both 'community' and 'institution'. No institution can exist without some kind of common spirit, some community and some fellowship; and, on the other hand, no community or fellowship can exist 'without some institutions that give it form, boundaries, discipline, and the possibilities of expression and common action'. (3) The Church is a pluralism and a unity. The Church is a body with many members 'none of which is the whole in miniature but in each of which the whole is symbolized'. (4) The Church is local and universal. 'The localized Church implies the universal, but the universal no less implies the local; without localization, without becoming concrete in a specific occasion, it does not exist'. (5) The

[1] H. Richard Niebuhr in collaboration with Daniel Day Williams and James M. Gustafson (Harper Brothers, New York; 20s. net.).

Church is protestant and catholic. It must always protest against the tendency to confuse the symbol with that which it symbolizes. 'It protests against every effort to bring the Infinite into the finite, the Transcendent into the immanent, the Eternal into the temporal. The only finite symbol of God it tolerates is the symbol of emptiness—the empty Holy of Holies, the empty tomb'. At the same time the Church must insist that 'unless the Infinite is represented in finite form, unless the Word becomes flesh over and over again, though only as oral preaching, unless the Risen Christ manifests Himself in the visible forms of individual saintliness and communal authority there is no human relation to the Infinite and Transcendent'. On the one hand there must be 'the rejection of all that is little because God is great'. On the other hand there must be 'the affirmation of the apparently insignificant because God is its creator, redeemer and inspirer'. (6) Finally, there is the antithesis of Church and world. 'The world is the community of those before God who feel rejected by God and reject Him; again, it is the community of those who do not know God and who do not seem to be known by Him; or, it is the community of those who knowing God do not worship Him.' And yet the fact remains that it is in that world that the task of the Church lies.

What then is the function of the Church? Dr. NIEBUHR sees many actual aims—the cultivation of the Christian life, the salvation of souls, the building up of the corporate life of the Church, 'the communication of the vital and redeeming doctrines of Scripture'; the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments, the development of the life of prayer and worship, the increase of belief in Jesus Christ, of discipleship to Him, and the glorification of His name. But he himself sees as the fundamental and basic purpose of the Church '*the increase among men of the love of God and neighbour*'. Beyond that purpose no purpose can go.

In view of this Dr. NIEBUHR sees certain confusions which must be faced and eradicated. (1) There is the confusion of the Church with religion, the confusion of the work of the Church with the work of its Lord, the confusion which identifies loyalty to the Church with loyalty to the Kingdom of God. This is like confusing loyalty to a party with loyalty to the *aims* of the party. This leads 'to an effort not to reconcile men to God or to redirect their love and ours toward God and the neighbour but rather to convert them to Christianity'. No one can take it for granted that if a man is brought into membership of the historical society called the Church love of God and neighbour will automatically follow. (2) There is the confusion between the Bible and God. Devotion to a book can take the place of devotion to the One who makes Himself known through that book. 'To give final devotion to the book is to deny the final claim of God; to look for the mighty deeds of God only in the records of the past is to deny that He is the living God; to love the book as the source of strength and salvation is to practice an idolatry that can bring only confusion into life.' 'It is one thing to recognize the indispensability of these means, another thing to make means into ends.' (3) Most serious of all is the confusion of the love of Jesus with the love of God, the 'substitution of Christology for theology'. This confusion arises when 'the proposition that Jesus Christ is God is converted into the proposition that God is Jesus Christ'. To do that is actually to deny the great function of Jesus Christ which is in fact to reconcile men to God. Dr. NIEBUHR sums it up: 'Denominationalism not the denominations; ecclesiasticism not the Churches; Biblicism not the Bible; Christism not Jesus Christ; these represent the chief perversions and confusions in Church and in theology'.

In this note we have had space to deal only with the problems which Dr. NIEBUHR raises and not with his solutions, and with his magnificent teaching regarding the Christian ministry. No one can lay down this book without experiencing the summons to basic and humiliating self-examination. If this book were widely and prayerfully studied, out of it there might well emerge a new reformation and a new revival in the Church.

Dr. C. Ryder SMITH exercised a great influence over many who are now in the ranks of the Christian ministry. As Professor of Theology in the University of London, and Tutor and Principal of Richmond College, Surrey, he was highly honoured both as a fine scholar and a brilliant teacher. Since his retirement he had used his leisure to put into book form the Biblical Theology which had been in earlier years the subject matter of his work in the lecture-room. His books on the Bible Doctrine of Salvation, of Man, of Sin, and of Grace have already become well known. His last book was completed just before his death, and is now published under the title *The Bible Doctrine of the Hereafter*.[1] Like the other books it is a thorough, systematic survey of all the Biblical teaching on the subject, and a clear impartial exegesis of it.

[1] Epworth Press; 30s. net.

The mental climate of to-day does not find it easy to accept belief in the after-life. Philosophy, psychology and anthropology at one time ranked as allies of the Christian Faith in this matter, but now it is not so. For the moment these studies appear to produce scepticism rather than faith. Increasingly belief in the after-life is an act of faith in what has been revealed rather than a logical deduction from natural phenomena. Our evidence for it is found mainly in the Bible and the continuing faith of the Church. Any competent study, therefore, of the Biblical evidence is a matter of great importance.

In the Bible it is everywhere taken for granted that there is a Hereafter, the idea of extinction being nowhere found, unless it be in a verse or two of Ecclesiastes. There is a Hereafter for the individual which begins at death, and also a Hereafter for 'mankind', since a perfect God cannot for ever be content with an imperfect world. Hence arose the doctrine of the two 'Ages'—the Present Age of sin and sorrow and imperfection, and the Future Age of righteousness and joy and perfection. For 'mankind' the Hereafter begins at the division of the two Ages, often called 'The Day'. It was not, however, until the latest Old Testament period that the Hereafter of the individual was precisely related to that of the community, by the asking of the question what part the righteous dead were to have in the Future Age of bliss. It was as an answer to this question that there arose the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous on 'The Day'. Only so, was it believed, could the righteousness of God be vindicated. 'The rise of this doctrine meant that the state into which a good man passed at death is only an intermediate state. For him the ultimate Hereafter was the same as for mankind and began on the Day. . . . The mankind of the future is to dwell, not in an undefined "heaven", but in the present world re-made'. So Dr. Ryder Smith summarizes the main teaching of the Bible.

It is well known that the Old Testament writers have little to say about the life of individuals beyond death. They speak with more confidence of the happy future for the 'community', and such individuals as are alive when this happy day dawns will share in it; but of the future of the many individuals who have died before that Day, the Old Testament says almost nothing. The time came, however, when men of Jewish Faith began to cry out that death was not a fit end for a righteous man, nor indeed was Sheol, that place of ghostly survival, shut off from the presence of God. 'Could it be', they asked, 'that the God with whom a man might live in fellowship would end by abandoning him?' So the conviction gained strength that the final destiny of the righteous man was not Sheol, but rather a resurrection to life.

In the Apocrypha, therefore, we find a developing faith in the resurrection of the individual. The writer of Wisdom, for instance, believed that there is to be a Day of Judgment, when the righteous will rise in triumph from the dead, and the wicked be condemned to their final doom. Ecclesiasticus and Second Maccabees also share this faith.

Throughout the New Testament the hope of a blessed future for the righteous is sure and radiant. The ground of this hope is in Christ. Man may be brought into fellowship with Christ here in this life, and this privilege is something that death will be powerless to destroy. Indeed beyond death this fellowship with Christ will be enhanced. Indeed the essence of this life beyond death is that it is life *with Christ*. To the dying thief Jesus says: 'To-day thou shalt be *with me* in paradise'. The promise of our Lord in Jn 14 is that 'Where I am, there ye may be also'. For Paul the final hope is to be 'for ever *with the Lord*' (1 Th 4^{17}) or '*at home with Him*' (2 Co 5^{8}), or 'to be *with Christ*' (Ph 1^{22}).

If logical consistency is to be required of Biblical writers, this 'being with the Lord' must be applied to the intermediate state which precedes the final resurrection, a kind of Christian substitute for the Hebrew Sheol, the privilege of those who have 'fallen asleep in Christ' (1 Co $15^{18\text{-}20}$). Modern readers do not find this thought of an intermediate state easy to understand, nor does it seem satisfactory to identify the joyous expectation of 'being with Christ' with a merely intermediate and temporary stage.

The author, however, does not attempt to meet this problem. His aim is to present Biblical teaching without discussing how far it needs interpreting into modern thought or how far modern thought must be confined within the strait-jacket of Biblical concepts. Perhaps we are wise to be content with a large degree of ignorance, and admit that the details of the future life and the time-table of any possible changes beyond death are 'not for us to know'. It is sufficient that God's word promises that, for the righteous, beyond death is life. This is God's promise and, as with all the promises of God, Christ is the 'Yes' to it. This life will be life with Christ.

There are chapters in the book which deal fully with the meaning of Sheol, Hades, 'eternal life', the two ages, the Parousia, Gehenna, Paradise, the state of the dead, the resurrection and

judgment. The final chapter considers 'The Evidence for Universalism', that is, the doctrine that at last every man will be saved. Earlier the author has affirmed that 'a sharp distinction is made in the New Testament between the ultimate fate of the wicked and the righteous respectively', and that 'in its several parts there is a doctrine of everlasting punishment'. But, it is asked, if God is love, will He let any man perish at the last? Dr. Ryder Smith acknowledges that 'it is very difficult to find this doctrine in the New Testament'. 'None the less', he believes, 'there are passages there which require that all men will be saved, passages which may be said to feel towards universalism'. Some passages in Isaiah anticipate this hope, and words of Jesus and the Apostle Paul may be expounded so as to imply it. Especially the Epistle to the Ephesians makes affirmations sympathetic to this doctrine.

If this is so, a plain inconsistency faces us in the Bible. Dr. Ryder Smith is content to acknowledge the fact: 'Throughout the New Testament there are the two doctrines which to the human mind are irreconcilable'. In Christian theology we must make the best we can of other apparent paradoxes —how Christ can be both God and man, how God Himself can be both Three in One and One in Three. 'Is it not possible', the author asks, 'that under the doctrines of Universalism and its opposite there is yet another antinomy—that is a truth that seems to the mind of man to contradict itself, but which is harmonious to the mind of God'? 'My thoughts are not your thoughts', saith the Lord.

Many readers will be specially interested in this defence of Universalism as a doctrine with Biblical authority.

Apostolic Succession [1]

By the Reverend A. Gordon James, Bournemouth [2]

If reunion between the episcopal and non-episcopal Churches, which many Christians desire, is ever to become an accomplished fact, an understanding must be reached on the question of the Apostolic Succession. Even though in its literal form, as embodied in Roman Catholic dogma and practice, it is unacceptable to all Nonconformists and many Anglicans, yet its underlying principles merit most careful examination by both. This is acknowledged in the statement put forward on behalf of the Methodist Church in the recently published interim report of Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church. The statement is so important that it merits quotation.

'While Methodism holds that a mechanical doctrine of unbroken succession by ordination from the Apostles themselves is both historically and theologically vulnerable, it readily assents that the ministry is a gift of God to the Church and that by the second century the Christian community everywhere regarded its episcopally ordained ministry as possessing a commission ultimately derived from that given by the Lord to the Apostles. . . . Unity of faith and discipline in ages of controversy and heresy needed a unified ministry which could appeal to the Apostolic Creed, the Apostolic Scriptures, and the Apostolic Succession'.

The statement goes on to affirm that without prejudice to the validity of other ministries, 'It is undoubtedly true that a ministry in the Apostolic Succession as commonly understood is authentic and valid'.

This is a significant admission. It avoids an unintelligent rejection of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession out of hand, pays due respect to the past history of the Church, and affords hope for the future. It will undoubtedly form a basis for further discussion and a closer examination of the terms in which the doctrine can be expressed.

It is obvious that those few Christians who are content with the present sectarian position will find no comfort in the kind of rapprochement offered by the Methodists. But those who feel acutely (and their number is growing) that 'our unhappy divisions' are in the nature of a scandal will not hesitate to give closer study to what is usually referred to as the problem of the episcopacy, with all that is involved.

What then are the principles involved? And whatever may have been thought necessary in the past, to what extent are they relevant to the life of the Church to-day? They may be summarized briefly as follows.

1. *Continuity.* The advantages of a successive

[1] Articles, from different points of view, on Apostolic Succession will follow monthly. In April the writer is Professor C. K. Barrett of Durham University.

[2] Mr. James, who has now retired, was Chairman of the North Lancashire District of the Methodist Church and one of the founder members of the Fellowship of the Kingdom.

line of ministry continuing through the ages, guarding Apostolic doctrine and linked, though only symbolically, with the first apostles, need no emphasis. There may or may not be a perpetual flow of Divine grace through ordination by the laying on of hands, but in any event the setting apart by the Church of representative individuals to mark the continued operation of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ has at least a dramatic value which enriches the Christian tradition. If it be objected that unworthy men have filled the office of Pope or Bishop, that does not necessarily destroy the spiritual continuity of the office itself, any more than an unworthy monarch destroys the validity of kingship. There is a dynastic glory in the long line of a regular apostolate, even though not all of those who are so ordained have achieved sanctity. Or again, if it be objected that the Apostolic Succession canalizes the operations of the Spirit of God, this can only be true if ordination be regarded as a ritualistic act which has been robbed of its essential meaning and thereby lost its value. No one denies that 'The wind bloweth where it listeth', and God uses whom He will. One might as well argue that because the Eucharist or Holy Communion is the avenue of sacramental grace that *only* in this manner can the water of life be conveyed to the thirsty soul, or the presence of Christ be made known to the devout worshipper. The regular order of Nature is not put out of gear by the operation of Divine Providence, nor is God limited by any sacramental act. Apostolic Succession, however interpreted, is a traditional symbol of God's watchfulness over His Church at all times and in all seasons and ought not to be lightly disregarded or frustrated by irresponsible sectarian manoeuvre.

2. *Catholicity.* It is of great importance that even in a divided Church the principle of catholicity should never be overlooked. It is not necessary to have complete unity of organization to preserve Apostolic doctrine, but it is of value to look to certain carefully selected individuals who can act in a representative capacity on behalf of the whole Church of Christ. This principle lies at the heart of the Apostolic Succession. It may be abused by the assumption of ecclesiastical tyranny, but the authority it betokens can and indeed needs to be checked by apostolic teaching of which it is the appointed guardian. No section of the Church can rightfully challenge any doctrine which is truly catholic in the sense that it is universally believed to be apostolic in origin and authenticated by the New Testament. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit there can be development in doctrine, as new light falls upon the Word of Scripture, but Christian doctrine derives from our Lord Himself, whose witnesses were the first apostles. The point at issue is whether the special grace given to these men has been passed on to their successors, thereby rendering them immune from serious error. The whole structure of Roman Catholicism rests upon this premiss. But the Roman interpretation of catholicity is not the only one. Apostolic Succession cannot be guaranteed by any adroit ritual act considered apart from what it is intended to convey; its significance lies in the preservation of apostolic truth, which binds together all Christians of all ages and in all places. This point is well made in the Anglican contribution to the Report quoted above. In setting forth the argument for Episcopacy, the writers declare:—

> 'The Episcopate symbolises and secures in an abiding form the apostolic mission and authority within the Church; historically the Episcopate became the organ of this mission and authority.
>
> 'In early times the continuous successions of Bishops in tenure of the various Sees were valued because they secured the purity of apostolic teaching as against (for example) the danger of the introduction of novel and erroneous teaching by means of writing or secret traditions falsely ascribed to apostolic authors. . . . He (the Bishop) is a living representative of the unity and universality of the Church.'

It is not easy to challenge the facts or overthrow the reasoning of this argument.

3. *Stability.* It follows from the foregoing that the Apostolic Succession is intended to secure the kind of stability referred to by St. Paul in his letter to the Ephesians. 'Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, after the wiles of error' (Eph $4^{13.\ 14}$). Unless private judgment is carried to an extreme, or every tradition accepted at its face value, or a rigid literalism applied to Old and New Testaments alike, some living authority must decide what is sound doctrine and what is not. Though the final authority is Christ, yet He speaks through His Church. It is not possible nor desirable that a plebiscite should be taken throughout Christendom, or even in a particular denomination, to ascertain the opinion of the majority of Christians on a point of doctrine, for truth cannot be determined by a popular vote. There must be some one or some body to speak *ex cathedra*, which does not necessarily imply infallibility in the Roman sense. Stability is not stagnation, and there are unspoken words of our Lord yet to come, words that His early disciples were not able to

bear. We have the promise of a fuller revelation, which shall glorify Christ and lead His Church into all the truth. The old is not to be rejected because it is old, nor the new accepted because it is new. A doctrine like the Atonement, for example, is not as yet defined in final form. It is both wise and prudent that within the Church there should be a body of men, competent to judge and endowed with Divine grace, who can not only speak for the Church as a whole, but can stabilize the truth of the gospel as apprehended by and in the Church. This St. Paul sought to do in his day, and some apostolic authority must do it in our day. 'There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema' (Gal $1^{7.8}$). The apostolic gospel can only be interpreted and applied by apostolic men, which is *raison d'être* for the Apostolic Succession.

It does not follow from what has been written above that the exaggerated claims made, for example, by the Church of Rome for an unbroken line of apostolic men existing from the beginning until now can be sustained. This is not historically credible. Nor does it follow that the episcopate as it functions to-day must forever be the only body competent to ordain by the laying on of hands. Still less can it be claimed that Episcopacy is the *only* vehicle capable of transmitting the grace of God to those who are called to the order of the ministry. We are concerned not with the outward form, although this cannot be dispensed with in a world such as ours, but rather with the principles to which the form bears witness. If we deny the dictum, 'No Bishop, no Church', we need not go to the opposite extreme of saying, 'Away with all Bishops'. The argument as to whether the episcopate is of the *esse* or the *bene esse* of the Church has gone on for a long time and will continue to go on for a long time to come. Important as this discussion is, it is not of the first importance. The question that has to be asked and answered is this. If the underlying principles of the Apostolic Succession are denied, what are to be put in their place? To preserve continuity, catholicity and stability in the Church, notably in matters of Christian doctrine, some authority there must be. What is that authority? It is to this fundamental question that all branches of the Church must pay attention, if any kind of reunion is to be sought. Unhappily, so much misunderstanding, prejudice and confusion still exist in all denominations, that something more is needed than argument. Only diligence in study, combined with earnest prayer on the deep level of contemplative devotion, both on the part of clergy and laity, of Church leaders and congregations, can open a door through which the Holy Spirit of God can enter into the corporate life of the Church in such fulness that will ensure the healing of the wounds in the Body of Christ.

Literature

ORDINATION OF WOMEN

NOWHERE has the Church, as represented by the majority of the denominations, shown itself more invincibly traditionalist than in its attitude to the ordination of women; and—now that a crisis has arisen over this issue—Miss Thrall's book—*The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood* ('Studies in Ministry and Worship': S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net)—is even more topical than perhaps she imagined when writing it. It is earnestly to be hoped that it will be widely studied, for it is learned and witty, trenchant but also commendably restrained. Although Miss Thrall considerably reinforces a position which, to the mind of the present reviewer, was all along logically unassailable, she moderately concludes: 'No doubt a great deal more theological discussion would be necessary before the question could be regarded as conclusively settled one way or the other. But there is enough theological evidence in favour of ordination to make it necessary for the Church to consider the matter much more seriously than it has done so far. There is at least the possibility that we are resisting the Spirit.' And again: 'In the matter of ordaining women we have not perhaps reached a clear enough understanding of the truth to make any decisive action necessary or possible. The vital question at the present moment is whether we are really and genuinely concerned to discover the truth.'

One is tempted to remark that the Church has had long enough, in all conscience, to discover the truth, and that decisive action is not only possible but painfully long overdue. Yet, as a matter of fact, part of Miss Thrall's argument turns upon the changed conditions that have arisen in comparatively recent times; and, if that is a valid argument, then now is the time to act, even if inaction may have been excusable in earlier centuries.

Her thesis, though impossible to represent with full justice in a compressed form, might be stated as follows. It is true that Gn 2 implies that woman

has only a derivative existence in the image of God ; it is true that the Word became incarnate as man and not as woman ; that the apostles were all men ; and that Paul placed woman below man in the hierarchy ' God-Christ-man-woman ', while Paul (and near-Pauline writings) enjoin the subordination, perhaps the complete silence, of women in the worshipping congregation. But, on the other side, Gn 1 gives a different picture—that of the equal and independent existence of man and woman in the image of God, with joint supremacy over Nature ; and in Christ, as the new Adam, God has inaugurated a new and redeemed humanity, able, in Him, to grow on from the Gn 2 to the Gn 1 position—a humanity in which woman (instead of being closer to ' σάρξ ' and at a remove from the image of God) is restored to an independent existence in the image of God like that of man. In short, a change in the status of woman is part of that ' given ' condition in Christ (that which Christians ' are ') which it is the duty of the Church to accept and implement (that which it has to ' become ').

In man's fallen condition, admittedly, only as male could the Word have established for mankind a direct relationship with God. Of Israel as it was, only men were full members, and therefore only male apostles could secure the continuity between the old Israel and the new, and only they could represent Israel to the Gentiles in the evangelistic expansion of the Church. But it is precisely by the coming of Christ and by the expansion of the Church that Gentiles and women have now been brought into full membership of the Israel of God. Conditions valid at the Incarnation and in the Early Church soon ceased to obtain. And as for the Pauline strictures, in idolatrous surroundings woman is perhaps more prone to fall into idolatry ; but in modern conditions and with women's education as it is, no such prohibitions necessarily still hold.

As for Aquinas' objection, this was based on the view that ' woman is naturally subject to man, because in man the discretion of reason predominates '—a summary statement which it is difficult to trace to any Biblical source, though Gn 2 may imply it, contradicting in this respect Gn 1. It would, one may add, close all ' professions ' to women. Again, psychological objections are shown to be distinct from the theological objections with which they are so often confused, and therefore to be at least irrelevant on the level of the present discussion.

In sum, then, it is urged that, in the redeemed society, no theological objections can be sustained against the ministry of the Word and Sacraments by women, if prevailing conditions permit. This might mean—it may be said in parenthesis—that where the education and social emancipation of women are still backward, there might remain strong reasons of expediency against their ordination, though it would still be theologically unexceptionable. But Miss Thrall does not herself make this point. She is only concerned to show that, given the right conditions and given a ' call ', the slamming of the door cannot be theologically justified.

The present reviewer is impressed but not wholly convinced by the use of Gn 1 as typifying the antithesis of Gn 2. Nor does he feel quite at ease about the reasoning by which the temporary subordination of woman and the temporary necessity of a male apostolate are explained, nor with an alleged difference between woman as wife (in subordination) and woman in other capacities. Here and there the argument seems a trifle arbitrary.

Whether or not such arguments are valid, however, what is decisive is the demonstration that ' subordinationist ' thinking, while claiming to be Biblical, has practically ignored Gn 1 in favour of Gn 2, and has concentrated on 1 Co 11^{1-10} but tended to forget *v.* 12 ; and has often confused theological principle with temporary expediency. Most important of all is the constant stress on the purpose of God in creation and redemption, which inevitably leads to a recognition of the transformation wrought in Christ for the redeemed community. That this transformation remains in some respects still unimplemented is part of the inevitable gap between what the Church ' is ' in Christ and what it has so far ' become ' ; but, by the same token, the full implementation is a standing duty and ideal, and there is no justification for making no effort to realize it.

Once again, and with greater learning and scholarly thoroughness than perhaps ever before, the slenderness of the argument against the ministry of women is here exposed. How long will it still be before ' the official leaders of the Church of England ' (and, for that matter, of some other denominations also) cease to treat the admission of women to the priesthood as ' an unimportant problem hardly deserving their serious attention ' ?

C. F. D. Moule

THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The late Dr. W. F. Howard often used to say that the greatest need of New Testament Studies was a work on New Testament theology comparable to the standard volume of H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament* [1885]. Many New Testament scholars must have felt the same, but Professor

Alan Richardson has gone a step further and has attempted to provide such a work in his interesting and valuable study, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (S.C.M. ; 30s. net). By New Testament theology he tells us that he means ' the framing of an hypothesis concerning the content and character of the faith of the apostolic Church, and the testing of this hypothesis in the light of all available techniques of New Testament scholarship, historical, critical, literary, philological, archaeological, and so on ', and he points out that this is the method adopted by the modern scientist. ' The scientist ', he reminds us, ' never starts with an empty mind ; he gets a " hunch ", frames an hypothesis, and then devises experiments to see whether the observable data can be " seen " better in this new way.' This is an interesting parallel, but the hypothesis Professor Richardson defends is much more than a ' hunch ', since it is nothing less than the claim that the events of the life, ' signs ', passion and resurrection of Jesus, as attested by the apostolic witness, can account for the ' data ' of the New Testament better than any other hypothesis current to-day. Jesus Himself, it is held, is the author of the brilliant re-interpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation found in the New.

Professor Richardson sees ' a rather curious paradox in the realm of recent New Testament interpretation '. This is the paradox that those who deeply scandalize the older ' liberal ' scholars by their readiness to detect symbols and images in what until recently seemed to be purely ' factual ' narrative, nevertheless seem to have no difficulty in believing the *kerugma* of Christ's Divine Sonship, of His resurrection and His return in judgment. ' It has become apparent ', he says, ' that we cannot build a theology of the New Testament —whether an orthodox one, like Gore's, or an heretical one, like Bultmann's—upon an imaginary bed-rock of objective historical " fact ".' The changed attitude, he explains in a later chapter, is largely due to the influence of R. H. Lightfoot and can be seen in the conclusions drawn by many of his colleagues and disciples concerning the typological and theological character of the Gospels. With the new movement Professor Richardson has considerable sympathy, even with the view that St. Luke is a rabbinical typologist, but fortunately in the main he follows the sound methods of the conservative-liberals in basing his conclusions upon the teaching of Scripture as in ' A Theological Word Book ' which he edited in 1950.

The book covers a wide field. After a valuable discussion of ' Faith and Hearing ' and ' Knowledge and Revelation ' the author treats such themes as the Power of God unto Salvation, the Kingdom of God, the Holy Spirit, and the Re-interpreted Messiahship. Then follow chapters on the Christology of the Apostolic Church, the Life of Christ, the Resurrection, Ascension, and Victory of Christ, the Atonement, the Whole Christ, and the Israel of God. The closing chapters discuss the Apostolic and Priestly Ministry, Ministries with the Church, the Theology of Baptism, and the Eucharistic Theology of the New Testament. Any one who follows so comprehensive a programme is bound to provoke dissent as well as to win hearty agreement, and it is natural and right that it should be so. Among questions which are sure to be the subjects of debate may be mentioned the description of justification as ' by the grace of God through baptism into the Church of Christ ', the tremendous emphasis laid on baptism, the degree to which the New Testament speaks of Christ as ' the Second Moses ' and ' the Second Elijah ' or suggests that the Virgin Mary is ' the Second Eve ', the nature of Holy Scripture, and the extent to which it is right to interpret New Testament teaching in the light of later developments in the second century. But no matter whether the reader agrees or not with Professor Richardson's views, he will be bound to recognize that here is a scholarly work of first importance in a field which has lain fallow all too long.

VINCENT TAYLOR

ALLEGORY AND EVENT

A thorough study of Origen's principles of exegesis has been produced by Dr. R. P. C. Hanson —*Allegory and Event* (S.C.M. ; 35s. net), a work which illuminates many dark corners of early Christian thought about the nature of the Biblical revelation and reflects some years of careful study on the part of the author. It is in essential respects a controversial book—by which I do not simply mean that Dr. Hanson has decorated his pages with pungent digs of disapprobation at other writers on this subject. It is his thesis that Origen led the Church gravely astray by a type of exegesis in which ' all is merged in a morass of spiritualizing exposition which has no legitimate ground in historical reality ', that his failure to take history seriously evacuates the gospel of all meaning for him, and that the root of the matter lies in his adulteration of Christianity with the poison of Platonism from which, in Catholicism at least, the Church has never been properly purged. This thesis is argued with learning and force on the basis of a close scrutiny of Origen's voluminous writings, together with aggressive (but not ill-tempered) onslaughts upon writers like Fr. de Lubac, S.J. It should be said that this is a book from which there is much to learn even if one does

not possess what Dr. Hanson would regard as the right prejudices. The collection of material is excellent, and there are many agreeable digressions. Moreover, it is a book concerned not merely with Origen in particular but with general principles in the interpretation of Scripture, and may be commended as a contribution to the contemporary discussion on ' hermeneutics '.

There are places in the book where the author offers a hostage or two to the unfriendly critic, and some unimportant slips in detail (for example, p. 72 Dura on the Orontes, p. 142 ff. J. A. Robinson did not edit Heracleon, etc.) which only go to illustrate the truth that all learned men make mistakes. The repeated statement that Origen was quite uninfluenced by Gnosticism cannot, I think, stand scrutiny ; I agree that the influence was peripheral. But these are marginalia, and it is the central thesis which demands comment. Here I submit only one simple reflection. Origen was seeking to commend the gospel to an educated public for whom, as indeed also for himself, certain Platonizing theses had the force of axioms, for example, that events belong to the world of sense and becoming, of change and decay, whereas truths belong to the eternal, immutable, and immaterial world, and that only remedial punishment is worthy of the Divine Being. The Christian faith, however, centred upon the concept of God's plan of salvation in history, culminating in the redemptive work of Christ and in the emergence of the Church as the new Israel, the elect people of God, exclusion from which carried consequences at the Last Judgment. An apologist faced by this fundamental tension could hardly avoid something snapping somewhere, and Dr. Hanson is obviously right in thinking that Origen's sense of allegiance to Athens frequently triumphed over his allegiance to Jerusalem, and certainly more often than he himself supposed. But I think Dr. Hanson is rather inclined to undervalue, or even to miss altogether, those aspects of Origen's thought which show him at any rate struggling to sing the Lord's song in a strange land.

H. CHADWICK

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The commentary on *The Gospel according to St. John* in ' The Torch Bible Commentaries ' series (S.C.M. ; 12s. 6d. net) has been written by Dr. Alan Richardson, Professor of Theology at the University of Nottingham. His principles of interpretation are strikingly different from the conventional approach to this Gospel, but they represent certain trends in modern scholarship.

He makes no attempt to defend apostolic authorship, claiming that the Gospel won its way ' not on the name of its author or sponsor, but by the sheer power and attractiveness of its testimony to Christ '. If a guess is to be made at the name of the author, that of John Mark seems the most favoured.

The Qumran texts are cited as evidence that what used to be regarded as clear marks of Hellenistic influence can be adequately accounted for within the life of Judaism. The same argument makes possible the assumption of a date earlier in the first century than has usually been allowed.

Canon Richardson, however, will not allow that this Gospel was written without knowledge of the Synoptics. ' We have in the Fourth Gospel ', he affirms, ' a highly original presentation of the truth about Jesus Christ, made by a bold and profound thinker who has long reflected upon the tradition enshrined for us in the Synoptic Gospels.' ' It is best regarded as itself a theological commentary upon the Synoptic tradition ', and the variations from it are introduced entirely for theological reasons. The evangelist is represented as changing historical events if by changing them he can symbolize a spiritual truth more pointedly. This indifference to historical fact is defended by Canon Richardson : ' St. John expresses the truth of history by means of a story that is not literally true ' ; and again : ' He is setting forth the truth of history by means of stories which are not in their details intended to be literally true '. We should not deny that spiritual truth can be embodied in a ' myth ', but is it correct to call it the ' truth of history ' ?

The ' Logos ' is interpreted entirely from its Jewish background, without reference to its significance for a Greek reader. The liturgy of the Church, and especially the sacraments, dominates the exposition. The fact that this Gospel does not record the baptism of Jesus and the institution of the Eucharist is due to the intention of the writer ' to withhold the sacramental mysteries from inspection by pagan eyes ', but in symbol and by implication the sacraments are found everywhere. Even the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus is included to affirm ' the necessity of Christian baptism ' (not spiritual renewal). It is denied that the eschatology of this Gospel is ' realized eschatology ' (as is often claimed) ; it is futuristic as in the other Gospels. If there is no unmistakable reference to the Second Coming, Canon Richardson finds it implied in the reference to the ' heavens being opened ' in 1^{51}, since this ' probably refers to the cataclysmic events of the Parousia, a consummation which is always present to the mind of the Johannine writer '. Partly on these grounds ' an underlying theological unity ' is claimed for this Gospel and the Book of the Revelation.

The fact that this commentary is written by Canon Richardson is guarantee of its high quality. Some of its extreme theological presuppositions will bring delight to those who share them, perplex those unfamiliar with them, and perhaps irritate those who do not agree with them. But it is a very interesting and useful presentation of a point of view in relation to this Gospel which is characteristic of one school of thought among present-day theologians.

C. L. MITTON

THE FAITH OF THE BIBLE

Canon J. E. Fison's book, *The Faith of the Bible*, is a very noteworthy one, and published as a 'Pelican' at 3s. 6d. net is within the reach of all. Seldom in the history of publishing has so much value been offered for so little. The price of it makes a long review unnecessary. It is a book which we can heartily commend, which we hope will have a large circulation, and which with its lucidity of style the reader may evaluate for himself. A glossary of technical terms is appended.

The author's aim in his own words is thus expressed—'the divisions of the Church seem to make a mockery of its claim to be one holy catholic and apostolic. That does not mean that the Creed should be scrapped; it demands rather that it should be understood. There is therefore need for a re-examination of the Biblical basis of the meaning of the words of the Creed and the book attempts such a re-examination.'

To understand Christianity we must begin with Judaism out of which it grew. So the first two chapters deal with the unity of God and the holiness of Judaism. A multitude of interesting points are dealt with. Two tragedies befell Judaism; for long before John the Baptist there was heard no real prophetic voice, and that largely accounts for the other tragedy, the interpreting of 'Covenant' as 'Contract', which led to legalism.

The third chapter is entitled 'The Catholicity of Christ'. Jesus was a devout Jew. He criticized Pharisees and refused to be identified with the Zealots, but He conceived His mission to be primarily for the Jews. He had some experiences which gave Him a glimpse of a mission to all mankind. He was 'catholic' in the sense that He loved and helped all who came to Him. But in no particular did He neglect the traditional worship of His compatriots. He cleansed the Temple. Where Presbyterians, for example, will fail to follow Dr. Fison is in his views as to the threefold ministry.

The fourth chapter on 'The Apostolicity of Christianity' is fascinating, very specially in the last sections, which show that the Unity of the Church does not forbid but is enriched by diversity. He takes the New Testament writings and shows that there are marked diversities of view as to the relation of Christianity to Judaism.

Mark and 1 Peter occupy a 'central position'; St. Paul's Epistles, Hebrews and Luke go to the 'left', and make a radical break with Judaism; James is on the extreme right, and St. Matthew may be reckoned on the same conservative side. Yet all are in the one New Testament, as their writers are all in the one Church. And the Johannine literature differs profoundly from all of them. It stands by itself. It is the final word on Christ.

W. D. NIVEN

The first edition of Professor F. W. Beare's *The First Epistle of Peter* (Blackwell; 25s. net), which comments on the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes, was reviewed in this journal in January 1948 [lix. 90 f.], when attention was drawn to its competent lexical, grammatical, and exegetical notes, together with criticisms of the author's conclusions regarding the date and authorship of the Epistle. A handsome second edition has now been published which in the main is a photographic reprint of the first. A few notes have been added within the body of the commentary and the account of the ancient versions has been largely rewritten. Especially valuable is a Supplement which covers the discussions of the relevant questions in the years 1946–57. A useful bibliography is supplied and three extended Notes on Dean Selwyn's defence of the authenticity of the Epistle and the Silvanus hypothesis, on the quest for source materials or forms provided by the common tradition of the Church, the nature and purpose of the Epistle, and the place of writing. Full indexes have also been appended. Professor Beare has not found reason to modify most of his earlier views, but abandons the opinion that the writing was produced within the region addressed and accepts a Roman origin as unquestionable. He thinks that Silvanus is no more likely to have been capable of writing it than the Apostle himself. The chief value of the work is that it supplies the reader with a scholarly contrast to many of the positions defended in Dean Selwyn's masterly commentary.

Dr. Cecil Roth first excited popular interest in his theory of the Zealot origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls in a broadcast talk on the B.B.C., and his elaboration in *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Blackwell; 10s. 6d. net) is very welcome. In his own words, he regards a passage in the 'Habakkuk Commentary', which refers

to the persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness as 'the basic text concerning the central episode in the history of the Qumran sect', and from this he develops the thesis that the sect was the Zealot party who flourished mainly from 46 B.C. to A.D. 73 and who figure prominently in the last struggles of Jerusalem, A.D. 66–70. The Teacher, he argues, was their leader Menahem who was killed in Jerusalem in 66, or his nephew Eleazar who survived the fall of Jerusalem and held out at Masadah, not far from Qumran, until A.D. 73. The hypothesis is vulnerable on the grounds that (*a*) too much is made to hang on the interpretation of an isolated and admittedly difficult passage, (*b*) it involves a drastic and subjective rewriting of 'sources' such as Josephus, (*c*) it fails to deal adequately with admitted anachronisms, such as the *Kittim* where they refer to pre-Zealot times. But aside from the main theory, the treatment generally makes useful suggestions, and must be consulted when a general assessment of the Scrolls is attempted.

Study Notes on Romans, by Dr. J. R. C. Perkin (Carey-Kingsgate Press; 4s. 6d. net), can be commended to any student of that great Epistle. It is not exactly a commentary, but it will facilitate the use of a commentary and it will enable the reader to grasp the outline of the apostle's thought without a commentary. Dividing the Epistle into eight parts Dr. Perkin casts real illumination on each, not least by his notes on some of St. Paul's key-words, such as law, sin, faith, blood, and life. There must be few who would not gain from working through the Epistle again with such a guide.

The Rev. John H. Withers, the minister of Fisherwick Presbyterian Church, Belfast, is already known through his earlier volume of sermons, 'An Arrow into the Air'. Now Messrs. James Clarke have just published *Speak For Yourself* (10s. 6d. net) which we warmly commend. Mr. Withers is thoroughly alive to the difficulties and needs of his people, and quietly and persuasively he sets out Christ's enabling power. We have quoted a sermon from *Speak For Yourself* (a sermon for young people) in 'The Christian Year' this month. It is given in slightly shortened form.

The Glorious Company, by the Rev. Frederick C. Gill (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), is described in its sub-title as Lives of Great Christians for Daily Devotion. It consists of brief biographies arranged for each day of the first six months of the year. Presumably the intention is to publish a second volume pursuing the same plan for the second six months. The persons commemorated are outstanding figures of Christendom, from the early Fathers of the Church down to the present century. To be reminded day by day of the witness and enduring influence of such notable Christians cannot fail to stimulate devotion. This is a book to be welcomed and used. Our only complaint is that in order to get each biography on a page the type has been made unduly small for ageing eyes.

In the need of bulbs for roots in the dark earth, and of a ditched lorry for a tractor to haul it out, and in the uses of life-boats and lighthouses and so on, a writer may find illustrations of moral and spiritual truths, and pen many reflections in the belief that the illustrations will engage the reader's interest and sharpen the point of the exhortation. *The Flame that Cannot be Quenched*, by Miss A. Graham Ikin, M.A., M.Sc. (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), is a collection of such essays.

The Independent Press has published at the reasonable price of 10s. 6d. net a book of American origin which should have a useful career in any English-speaking country—*Bible Primer*, by Dr. Ray Freeman Jenney. It consists of short sketches of each of the sixty-six books of the Bible. The author's aim has been not so much to discuss questions of date and authorship, though the historical situation is not ignored, but rather to state briefly the high-lights and the central message of each book, and to do that in such a way that the reader may approach the Bible with some vision of its wholeness. Adequate scholarship and a gift of condensation are required for this task and the author seems to have both. This is a book that will facilitate Bible study and Bible understanding as distinct from that familiarity with a few favourite passages which is all the acquaintance with the Bible that too many possess.

'True preaching', says the Rev. Truman B. Douglass in *Preaching and the New Reformation* (Independent Press; 9s. 6d. net), 'presupposes a Church, and the chief business of the preacher is to enable the Church to make its proclamation'. Division in the Church distorts its witness and hinders its mission. The Church must itself first be healed of division within itself if it is to heal the divisions of the world. The Church must be united in Christ. This ought to be presented in the preaching of the Church to-day. The Reformation of the sixteenth century led to divisions. The New Reformation will lead to unity. That is a worthy vision, but enormous difficulties lie in the way of realization; we are not sure how far Mr. Douglass realizes that side of it.

Great Themes of the New Testament

III. Romans v. 12–21 (*Continued*)

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., the University of Glasgow

We have seen the place that the Adam story had in Jewish thought, and now we must go on to see the use which Paul made of it.

Paul has two problems to solve. First, how did sin and death get into the world and gain such a universal dominion over men? Second, how is it that Jesus Christ rescues men from that situation? As C. H. Dodd points out, the person to whom Paul preached might well say: 'I am quite prepared to accept the greatness of Jesus Christ. I accept him as a great, heroic, wise, prophetic figure. But He is one man, one single individual. How can that which one single individual has done possibly affect all mankind?' These are the questions which Paul sets out to answer in this passage.

Paul twice in his Letters uses the Adam story. He uses it in a much more summary and simplified way in 1 Co 15^{21-22}: 'Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive'. This is the principle which is more fully worked out in Ro 5^{12-19}. T. R. Glover (*Paul of Tarsus*, 25) speaks of 'the tangents that haunt Paul's writings', and says that these tangents 'show the sudden swiftness with which he pounces on a new idea or truth'. It is not strictly true to say that *vv.* 13–17 are a tangent, but they are a parenthesis as the A.V. correctly shows. The dilemma is stated in *v.* 12. It was by one man's sin that sin entered into the world. The whole thesis of the passage is stated in *v.* 18. Verse 18 is an extraordinarily telegraphic verse; there is not a verb in it from beginning to end. It reads almost like a skeleton mnemonic of the scheme of salvation: 'So then—as through one trespass—to all men—to condemnation—so also—through one righteous act—to all men—to justification of life'. To put it in one brief sentence—in Adam all men became sinners, in Jesus Christ all men became righteous. How, then, does Paul work this out?

We must begin from *v.* 12—'As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*'. What is the meaning of the last phrase? In the phrase *ἐφ' ᾧ* is the *ᾧ* masculine or neuter? If it is masculine the only possible antecedent must be *Adam*, who is, as it were, contained in the expression *one man*. The meaning will then be that sin and death entered into the world through one man in whom all sinned. This is the way in which Bengel took it—'*omnes peccarunt Adamo peccante*'. If it is neuter, then the phrase will mean that sin and death entered into the world through one man, in that all sinned. In either case the meaning is the same; and in any event the important and significant matter is the tense of the verb *ἥμαρτον*. That verb is an aorist. It means that sin and death entered into the world, not because all men *sin*, as it were habitually, but because all men *sinned*. Further, if we are to give the aorist tense its full value, and in this argument we must do so, the more precise meaning will be that sin and death entered into the world because all men were guilty *of one act of sin*. In *v.* 19 the matter is put in a different way—'By one man's disobedience the many were constituted [*κατεστάθησαν*] sinners'. It is to be noted that the Greek has the article before *many*—*οἱ πολλοί*—a point which the A.R.S.V. misses, but which Moffatt correctly takes, when he translates, 'Just as one man's disobedience made *all the rest* sinners'. The contrast is between the single individual Adam and the many, who are the rest of mankind. What, then, does Paul mean, when he says that in the one sinful act of Adam all mankind sinned, and by that one act all were constituted sinners? Four main explanations have been advanced.

1. It has been taken to mean that 'every man is his own Adam' (2 Bar 54^{19}), that judgment and condemnation and death have come upon mankind, each man *for his own sin*. The Greek Fathers usually adopted this explanation. Theodoret comments: 'Not on account of his forefathers' sin, but on account of his own, each man received the doom of death'. Cramer in the *Catena* quotes Cyril who says that the meaning is that 'we have become imitators [*μιμηταί*] of the sin of Adam', and that sin spread through the world and mankind

'like an infection from a root'. This interpretation individualizes man's responsibility for sin, and is, in fact, as we shall see, the precise opposite of the whole argument of Paul.

2. There is what is called the *legal* interpretation. It holds that Adam acted, not for himself alone, but as the *representative* of the human race, and that naturally, correctly and inevitably the human race is involved in the responsibility for the action of their representative. The objection to this view is that a representative cannot be in any real sense a representative, unless he is *chosen* by those whom he represents. This is certainly not the case with Adam; and to make people responsible for the actions of a representative with whose choice they had nothing to do is intolerably unjust.

3. There is the interpretation which suggests that what mankind inherited from Adam was the *tendency* to sin. Cramer in the *Catena* cites Gennadius as saying that what man inherited was Adam's *nature*. The result of this is that theoretically man has freedom of choice, and need not sin, unless he chooses to do so; but practically, and in point of fact, sin is inevitable because man's inherited nature is such as it is. From the Jewish point of view, we might express this by saying that the evil tendency, the *yetzer ha-ra'*, is the nature which mankind inherited from Adam, and that it makes man's sin inevitable. From the modern point of view, we might express this by saying that, because of his heredity, man is inevitably predisposed to sin.

4. To the mind of a modern man the third of these interpretations is undoubtedly the most acceptable; but equally undoubtedly it is not what Paul meant. So we come to the fourth interpretation, which is called the *realistic* interpretation. According to this interpretation the meaning of this passage is that quite literally all Adam's descendants sinned in Adam; that they sinned in Adam's sin; that they literally committed an act of sin, when Adam disobeyed and sinned. There is a very close parallel to this kind of thought in the Letter to the Hebrews. The author is seeking to establish that the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek is the supreme priesthood, greater than any existing priesthood. We are told in Scripture that Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek. In Jewish religious law it was to the tribe of Levi, to the Levites, that tithes were paid. But when Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek, Levi, though still unborn, was in the loins of Abraham; and, therefore, in Abraham the yet unborn Levi paid tithes to Melchizedek, which means that the tribe whose right it is to receive tithes actually paid tithes to Melchizedek, a fact which establishes the unique supremacy of the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek (He 7^{5-10}). Here, then, Levi is literally credited with an action which took place before he was born.

Paul's basic contention is that all men literally and really sinned in Adam. Man is not only, so to speak, a sinner in his own individual right; Adam is not simply the representative of mankind; it is not simply the tendency to sin which man inherited from Adam; every individual man sinned in the sin of Adam, and is personally involved in that sin. Behind Paul's conclusions there lie two general principles, without which he could not have arrived at his conclusions.

Behind the whole argument there lies the principle of *solidarity*. The modern Western mind has become so used to thinking in terms of the individual that for it the idea of solidarity is difficult to grasp. In early and in primitive times men tended to think of themselves, not as individuals, but as members of a clan, or family, or group. Apart from the group their lives have no meaning or significance. They do not exist as individuals, and they do not think of themselves as individuals; they think of themselves always as being indissolubly bound up within the group. It is said that, if an Australian aborigine is asked his name, he will begin by giving, not his own name, but the name of his tribe. This idea of solidarity is part and parcel of Jewish thought at all times.

We see it dramatically exemplified in the story of Achan (Jos 7). The children of Israel had taken Jericho, but the condition of its capture had been that no man should keep any of the spoils for himself, and that everything in the city should be totally destroyed except the vessels of silver and gold and brass and iron, which must be consecrated to the treasury of the Lord (Jos 6^{17-19}). Achan had disobeyed this condition, and had taken for himself a goodly Babylonish garment, two hundred shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold of fifty shekels weight. At the time Achan's disobedience was not known. The Israelites moved on to deal with Ai. It was reported that Ai was so insignificant that a small force was sufficient to capture it. But in the campaign against Ai Israel suffered a serious and humiliating setback and defeat. It was clear that in some way the nation had offended against God. The guilty party had to be found. On God's instruction Joshua took the people tribe by tribe, household by household and family by family. By a process of elimination Achan was discovered. He admitted his sin. He and his whole family, his sons and his daughters, were taken to the valley of Achor, and first stoned, and then burned to death. Here the principle of solidarity is demonstrated. The whole nation was involved in, and affected by, the sin of Achan. When it came to a matter of

punishment, not only was Achan punished; his whole family was wiped out along with him as a group.

Given this principle of solidarity, it is possible to see why the whole human race is involved in the sin of Adam. Adam and all his descendants are bound up in one, and what the head of the family did the whole family did in him, and the whole family is equally responsible.

The second principle which lies behind Paul's whole argument is the connexion of death with sin. Adam was created for immortality; Adam sinned and lost his immortality. The belief is that if there is no sin there is no death, and death is the direct consequence of sin.

Let us now set out the steps of the argument in which Paul demonstrates the fact that in Adam all men sinned.

1. Adam sinned by a direct act of disobedience to an expressed command of God (*v.* 12), and because of that sin, death came to Adam.

2. Between Adam and Moses the law did not exist, for the law was not given until it was given to Moses. If there is no law, there can be no breach of the law, and, therefore, there can be no such thing as sin. Sin is not reckoned against a man when there is no law (*v.* 13).

3. In spite of the fact that there was no law, and, therefore, no debiting of sin between Adam and Moses, men continued to die. Those who had not sinned in the way in which Adam sinned nevertheless still died. The Greek is that death came *ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ* (*v.* 14). It is clear that for certain of the copyists the argument was as difficult as it is for us, for in certain manuscripts the *μή* is missed out; and the statement becomes a statement that death came to those who *had* sinned in the same way as Adam sinned, which is exactly what Paul does not say.

4. But if death is the direct cause of sin, which is disobedience to the law, and if between Adam and Moses there was no law, and, therefore, no possibility of disobedience to the law, *why was it that men died*? The answer is—they died because they had sinned in Adam. Here is the proof that all men are involved in the sin of Adam. The undeniable fact that men still died under a dispensation when there was no law to break is for Paul the proof that all men are involved in the sin of Adam, and sinned in him. They inherited death because in Adam they sinned.

So, then, by the sin of Adam all men were constituted sinners. At this point we must take in another Pauline idea, which comes at the end of the passage, but which for its place in the argument must be included here. Between Adam and Moses there was no law as yet given; but with Moses the law came; and, says Paul, 'the law entered that the offence might abound' (*v.* 20). Here, indeed, is a startling statement. How can the law be responsible for the *increase* of sin? There is more than one answer to that question.

1. The law necessarily makes a man aware of sin. When he receives the law he becomes conscious of the things which are sins, and of himself as a sinner. To put it another way, the law defines sin.

2. There is, therefore, a sense in which the law creates sin. To take a simple and imperfect analogy—it may be perfectly permissible for a long time to drive a motor car up or down a certain street, and to commit no crime. A new traffic regulation is approved, and that street then becomes a one-way street. By that new law a new breach of the law is there and then created, and there is one more crime which it is possible for a man to commit. Once the law comes, it defines sin, and in defining sin, it creates sin, for it renders illegal acts against which previously there was no law.

3. But there is a still more serious sense in which the law increases sin. It is a fact of human experience that once a thing is forbidden it develops a fatal fascination and attraction. That is exactly the situation which Paul personally knew so well. The commandment created desire; the command came and sin revived; sin took occasion by the commandment (Ro 7^{7-11}). Human nature being what it is, the fact that a thing is forbidden by the law thereby gives to that thing a new desirability.

But how can we say that the law was given *in order that* sin might abound and increase? Augustine here presents us with a helpful analogy (Augustine, on Ps 102^{15}): 'In this God acted not with cruelty, but for the purpose of healing. For sometimes a man thinks himself whole, and is sick; and, inasmuch as he is sick and perceives it not, he seeks not a physician; but the disease is increased, the inconvenience grows, the physician is sought, and all is healed'. The idea is that the law made sin so acute, and the situation so desperate, that men are compelled to seek the remedy which only God can give.

Here, then, is the situation in which man is involved. By Adam's sin every man is constituted a sinner. Even if a man is a saint, he is none the less a sinner. Even if a man had committed no sin in his own person, he would still be a sinner. That is what the doctrine of original sin means. Further, the coming of the law has made matters worse, and has still more inextricably involved man in sin. Here is a literally desperate and hopeless situation. Man is inescapably involved in sin.

In a situation like that only God can find a solution; and God found that solution by sending

His Son into the world in the form of a man. Here a new factor enters the situation. In Jesus Christ, who is perfectly man, mankind makes a new beginning. Adam by his disobedience sinned, and thus rendered all men sinners. Jesus Christ by His perfect obedience conquered sin, and thus opened to all men the possibility of righteousness. Men were constituted sinners in the man Adam; men can be constituted righteous in the new man Jesus Christ.

Here, then, is the conception which Paul lays down in his passage. What are we to say of it, and wherein lies its permanent value?

It may well be that it is a mistake to treat this passage as theology at all. Paul was confronted with two things—the utter hopelessness of man in a Christless life; and the complete recreation of life in a Christ-filled life; and to express this double situation he uses this picture. T. R. Glover wrote of Paul (*Paul of Tarsus*, 109): '"The depths of God" it is Paul's life-work and supreme interest to explore; he does not exhaust them. One of the reasons why Paul has been so inadequately studied of late years is that he was for long construed as a final authority, and his writings taken as a compendium of Theology, while his own idea was that he was a learner'. We would do well to remember that Paul did not write this passage as theology; he wrote it as a pictorial attempt to express the human situation, and how Christ altered that situation. If Paul's picture is pressed with literalness, it fails.

It involves accepting the story of the Fall as literal, factual history, and there are comparatively few who would be willing to take that definite step.

It confuses two kinds of relationships. Even if we take the story of the Fall literally, our connexion with Adam is very different from our connexion with Jesus Christ. In that case our connexion with Adam is something which we cannot help; no man has anything to do with who his ancestors are; our connexion with Adam is a purely physical relationship which we cannot by any means avoid or alter. On the other hand our connexion with Jesus Christ is very different; it is something which we can accept or refuse. Jesus Christ is not our ancestor; He is the free gift of God to men (*vv.* 15. 16). Our connexion with Him is not a physical connexion; it is a connexion of grace (*vv.* 15. 20. 21). Even as Paul himself tacitly admits, the fact that in Adam we are constituted sinners is a universal situation which no man can avoid simply because he is a man; the fact that we can become righteous, through our connexion with Christ is a possibility which some through faith will accept, and others through unfaith will reject. The fact is that there is no true parallel between a man's connexion with Adam and his connexion with Jesus Christ. If there were a true connexion, then the obedience of Jesus Christ would make all men righteous as automatically as the sin of Adam made all men sinners. Adam's sin gave men a status which no man could avoid; Jesus Christ's obedience opens to men a status, which every man must claim in faith.

But, even when we have made our criticisms, there remains eternal value in the picture which Paul here paints.

Seldom have the human dilemma and man's total helplessness to solve it been more powerfully presented. It remains true that man is a sinner, powerless to deal with his own sin apart from Jesus Christ. The human situation is a hopeless situation without God's entry into it in Jesus Christ.

Seldom has any thinker taken the Incarnation with such seriousness as Paul takes it here. The only thing which could rescue the human situation was God's identifying Himself with that situation in Jesus Christ. And it is worth noting the effect of Paul's picture on any thinking about the Incarnation. In Paul's thinking Jesus Christ, in order to rescue man, had to be as fully man as Adam was; His identity with men had to be complete. Further, in Paul's thinking the life of Christ must be given an importance on an equality with the death of Christ. As an antidote to the disobedience of Adam Jesus Christ brings to God the perfect obedience. It is true that the culminating act of that obedience was the death of Christ, but that death would have been without value apart from the life of obedience which led up to it.

The supreme value of Paul's thought in this passage is the way in which it completely identifies Jesus Christ with mankind and with the human situation and with every man. Turgeniev has a story of a lad who was in church one day. As he listened to the story of Jesus Christ, he longed to see Christ, as it were, with his very own eyes. A man came and sat beside him; and there came to the lad the conviction that the man beside him was none other than Jesus Himself. He was quite certain that this was He. And in his certainty he turned and looked, and to his intense surprise he saw that Jesus had 'a face like all men's faces'. We may criticise Paul's analogies and Paul's arguments; we may find his presuppositions strange and alien to our way of thought; the fact remains that he leaves us with the supreme truth that God rescued man by identifying Himself with man in Jesus Christ.

Milestones in Books. VI.

By Professor T. E. Jessop, O.B.E., M.C., M.A., Litt.D., The University of Hull [1]

Being a teacher of philosophy, I had better restrict myself to writings within this sphere; and by keeping to originals (avoiding commentaries) I have little difficulty in selecting from those that rank high in my judgment and are rooted deeply in my affections a few which I can confess, whether creditably or no, to be my favourites, and which I can therefore write about with frank pleasure. Not one of them is recondite. They are likely to appeal to readers of this series, because my interest in philosophy is, under and over its technical fascination, strongly religious and moral.

1. Let me begin with Plato. The love of him goes back to my undergraduate days. Not of all his writings, for I had not then learned how to read them: with undiscriminating respect I took all the passages as serious, as Platonic doctrine, and was therefore left perplexed—not having seen that here he was mimicking his opponents the Sophists and there teasing them with their own tricks of arguing, sometimes indulging in sheer fun, and often reaching no doctrine but testing a method or line of inquiry. When these aspects are seen, nearly all that he wrote can be read with unfeigned enjoyment and immense intellectual stimulus. I shall never forget the impact on me of his *Phaedo*, *Symposium*, and *Phaedrus*: they flung me into a new way of journeying up to the heights where a religious mind delights to be. They are out of fashion now among English philosophers, for these have decreed that philosophy must never use wings, never run like Achilles but creep like the tortoise, a logical infinitesimal at a time; and, of course, all 'uplift' is taboo. Well, Plato has logical finesse enough and to spare, many of his dialogues being contests with rapiers. In the three dialogues mentioned, however, his whole mind mounts on all its four powerful engines—intellectual, moral, religious and artistic. He was his own best critic, yet aware that the reach of his insight was further than that of his logic.

Those three dialogues contain, among other things, his famous Theory of 'Ideas'. At bottom, it is based on the obvious imperfection of everything we meet in sense. Obvious? Yes, because each of them evokes in the mind the notion of its paragon or ideal. After all, nothing can be judged imperfect unless the perfect be seen alongside it by the mind's eye; and Plato's rational faith was that what is thus logically prior in judgment is prior in reality too. Reality is a system of perfect types. The sensible things that at varying degrees of remoteness approximate to them exist in a manner, but are not 'really real', for they are shot through with negativity—not what their types are, not existing a while ago, not to exist a while hence—whereas the perfect never was not, never will not be, and cannot change.

In the *Phaedo* (for long centuries the most renowned of his writings) the theme arises in a conversation during Socrates' last hours. The martyr's belief in immortality remains untroubled; it is the theories put forward to justify it that come and go, yet each leaves a residuum. Every thought and desire that rises above sense is in effect anticipating the soul's liberation at death, when, if it has exercised itself well here, it will behold without obstacle or mediation the realm of the really real, its premonitions of which in philosophizing are a proof of its own essential and therefore indestructible reality. In the *Symposium* or *Banquet* (one translation of which is by Shelley) the occasion, as the title suggests, is less solemn. Here is Plato's ascent of love, known to our earlier poets, from the beauty of sense to that of soul, of the clean notions

[1] T. E. Jessop, O.B.E., M.C., M.A., Litt.D., is Ferens Professor of Philosophy in the University of Hull. He was born in Huddersfield on 10th September, 1896, and one of his glories is that he is a Yorkshireman. After the University of Leeds he went to Oriel College, Oxford. Professor Jessop's life has been given to philosophy and religion, in the latter to practical service as well as to writing. He is a Methodist lay preacher, and he serves on a number of Committees for his Church. For eighteen years a special activity has been work with the Forces, for the educational and the chaplaincy branches. The author of many important works, Professor Jessop's major academic work has been his collaboration with A. A. Luce in the nine volumes of the works of Bishop Berkeley. Last term Professor Jessop gave a series of lectures on 'The Christian Morality' in Cambridge University, under the Faculty of Divinity.—Editor.

and precise relations of knowledge, to the fontal Beauty, which, like the other 'Ideas', abides incorruptibly 'in the realm above the heavens'. This phrase comes from the *Phaedrus*, which starts from the unpromising problem of the rules and purpose of making public speeches. The orator must know his linguistic craft, and be master also of his occasional material: but how can he move the soul unless he know its nature, and how can he know this without investigating also the universe with which its knowledge and aspiration link it? For knowledge is not 'science', not unchangeable and explanatory, unless it is of the perfect, when it is 'a recollection of those things which in time past our soul beheld when it travelled in the company of the gods', *i.e.*, before it was embodied; by philosophizing it 'recovers its plumage'. The tale of the soul seeking to regain its prenatal vision of the 'Ideas' (cognition of which is recognition or recollection) is told with witty interludes about the speech-makers who merely put words together cleverly.

When even these few dialogues are read, it is easy to detect the Platonism in the Greek Fathers, Augustine, Anselm, in the sonnets of Michelangelo, in many of our own poets, and, to jump, in Archbishop Temple; for Platonism pervades most of Western culture like an atmosphere.

2. For moral bracing, I like to turn to Epictetus, the crippled freedman who taught Stoicism in Epirus round about A.D. 100. His *Encheiridion* or *Manual*, a small selection of short passages from his lectures, never fails to grip me, and sometimes sends me to the four books of his *Discourses*. Some prefer to read Stoicism in the fastidiously shaped sentences of Seneca. Others may like, as I do at times, to keep company with the poignant and often beautiful broodings of Marcus Aurelius. I turn by preference to Epictetus. Nowhere in the ancient pagan world was there, so far as I know, excepting possibly Diogenes of the tub, a moral teacher who spoke with such simplicity, directness, robustness and concreteness as he did. Although familiar with the theoretical side of Stoicism, his whole interest was in its application, which he made with bluntness, lightened with a little banter, and solemnized with a restrained piety. Take a sample of this last: 'Remember that you are an actor in a play, of a kind decided by the Master, short or long as He wills. If He wants you to act the part of a beggar, you are to act it with good heart, and so too if it is the part of a cripple, a magistrate, or an ordinary citizen. Your task is to act well the rôle given you; to choose it is Another's'.

Aulus Gellius attributes to him the maxim, 'Bear and forbear', but this of itself gives little idea of the definiteness of his teaching. In no other writer is the basic Stoic distinction between what is in our power and what is not (the former alone being the sphere of moral good and evil) made so utterly clear for practice. Has your servant spilled your oil or your wine? Well, that is outside your control, so don't be vexed. You've been abused, robbed, wounded? The deeds are others', not yours, and can't hurt you unless you let them, for it is only your *judgment* that a thing is bad that makes you feel it so, and your judgment is wholly within your power. Superb, indeed. He goes on, consistently: your son is bad, your wife or child has died? These also are outside your control, therefore morally indifferent, neither good nor bad for you, and so not to be made an occasion for grief. This ruthless logic of Stoicism comes out repeatedly: for example, if an acquaintance is bereaved, you will try to comfort him, but if you *feel* pity you are no Stoic.

The old charge, to which Lightfoot gave a lengthy reply, that St. Paul must have cribbed from the Stoics, because he was born in one of their centres, used one of their special terms, 'self-sufficient' (Ph 4^{11}; A.V. 'be content'), and quoted their poet Cleanthes (Ac 17^{28}), is grotesque. Between the cult of a cosmic Reason, requiring anaesthetization even of compassion and family love, and the religion and morality of *agapē*, there is a great gulf fixed. To read Epictetus is a healthy exercise in response and recoil, in moral admiration and moral repugnance. We realize that the logic of reason is not the logic of morality. He forgave everybody; but he pitied nobody. We glow, then shiver; and then glow again when we see that he did not pity even himself, although he had been a slave, had been lamed by an act of cruelty, had been expelled from Rome with the other philosophers, and, to teach and test his philosophy, remained extremely poor. He was a morally great man, whom no Christian would copy. Until nearly a century ago, he was abundantly read. He deserves to be still, to give us muscle.

3. Bishop Butler usually means the author of the *Analogy*; for me, the author of *Fifteen Sermons preached at the Rolls Chapel* [1726]. The thinking being close, the reading is not smooth, but the condensed sentences often have massive power. Two things stand out: Butler's empirical penetration and his intellectual probity. My considered judgment is that the volume is the most soberly valuable contribution to ethics made by any Briton. Like nearly all our moral philosophers of the eighteenth century (Hume included), he was replying to Hobbes's contention that human nature is wholly and incorrigibly selfish.

The preaching note is there, but the substance is an argued appeal to experience. Looking at the

natural man, it is a natural ethic he is fashioning, this being why the sermons are read by teachers of philosophy (and are *supposed* to be read by their students). His map of the mind in its moral aspect is searchingly simple. He finds three kinds of factors. (1) What he calls 'particular passions', spontaneous movements towards particular objects, natural responses to given situations, like wanting a meal or feeling compassion at the sight of a misfortune. They fall into the two classes of those that *conduce* to one's own good and those that *conduce* to the good of others, but do not *aim* at anything so general. The first are not selfish, nor are the second altruistic, being too particular and spontaneous to be either. (2) General ends. These belong not to the raw stuff of the moral life, but to the level of reflection. There are two, which Butler calls (using the terms of his day) Self-love and Benevolence. A man is selfish only when he makes his own good the general principle of his conduct, and altruistic when the good of others is his general end. (3) Conscience. We falsify even the bare description of the moral life if this is not noted as different in kind from the preceding two. What are its marks? First, it is what puts the label of morally right or wrong on the two general ends; secondly, it judges some things (for example, justice) to be right or wrong in themselves, absolutely, without reference to either of those ends, and thirdly, it operates, unlike impulses and ends, not with mental force but with authority. It is in every man something 'which, without being consulted, magisterially asserts itself, and approves or condemns him, the doer, accordingly'; and 'if it had strength as it has right, had it power as it has manifest authority, it would absolutely govern the world' (*Serm.*, II).

Even this bald summary is enough to expose the mere facileness of an egoistic theory (which some theologians fall into); to check us against such systematic simplifications as reducing all to one end, or any end, *i.e.*, letting the idea of attractive good push out the idea of command of duty; and to make us see the radical distinction between the notion of force or felt intensity and that of authority. But also *en passant* Butler shows his probing insight. It is a moral education to read his fifteen sermons, the best edition of which is edited by the present Dean of St. Paul's.

4. Butler's contemporary, Bishop Berkeley, is to me an unfailing joy. Among other merits, he stands in the topmost rank of our stylists: Saintsbury confesses that it was in reading Berkeley that he first got 'the idea of beautiful prose as such'. The beauty is not painted on; it arises out of the extraordinary lucidity of his thinking, his flair for the right word, and a delicate ear for the ways in which phrases, sentences, and paragraphs can be shaped. The two writings I would pick out are *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous* [1713] and *Alciphron* [1732], the latter also in the form of dialogues, and both of them masterly examples of his style.

The first contains his philosophy in marvellous exposition, *facile princeps* in all our philosophical literature. His theory that the corporeal world cannot without sheer nonsense be believed to exist by itself, that it was not only originated by God but can exist only as the *object* of the creative mind, by whose direct act it becomes an object of ours—this theory does not seem a promising one for exposition to the general reader, yet this was his aim in the *Dialogues*. In the delightful conversation technical issues are not shirked, but made plain, for Berkeley was the simplest—disconcertingly simple—of all the well-known philosophers. When we use our senses, what exactly do we apprehend? What can be said for and against the physicists' view that sensations are effects in the mind of things outside, and at the same time partial copies of these? And for the hoary philosophical postulation of a 'substance' or 'essence' underlying all the knowable features of physical things, which amounts to saying, 'Something there is in every drop of water, every grain of sand, which it is beyond the power of human understanding to fathom or comprehend'. With the simplicity of genius he sweeps the field clean of occult material entities. There is no introduction like this to the philosophical problems that have loomed large in the classical British philosophy.

Of *Alciphron* there is room for only a sentence or two. Philosophical only here and there (without his peculiar theory), it is a work in Christian Apologetics, a defence against the 'free thinkers', both atheists and deists. In literary quality it is probably the finest of his writings. The matter of the argumentation is, of course, relative to the knowledge of the day. The form, however, is still instructive: Berkeley has a way of making explicit the logical criteria of his thinking, and those of any position against which he is arguing. To-day we have become inept in apologetics. If theological students were to work their way through *Alciphron* they would learn the technique of honest and resourceful controversy—and learn to speak English.

The Relevance of the Prophets to our own Day[1]

By The Reverend Canon Lionel du Toit, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Windermere

I believe that in the prophets we shall discover the very genius of our religion. The foundations are already truly laid and the main direction which the tradition would afterwards take is already beginning to appear in a most remarkable fashion in their work. When the Incarnation of God in Christ takes place and the Christian Church and the Christian faith are called into being, there is of course something new and supernatural introduced to crown the process. It is not a mere evolutionary growth from below. And yet at the same time the main lines of a previous tradition are meeting together and the genius of that tradition is reaching fulfilment. So the Christian scribe, instructed in the Kingdom of Heaven, brings out of his treasure things new and old. In this large way there is fulfilment, and the prophets point forward to Him that is to come. The Christ would be unintelligible except as the fulfilment of this particular religious tradition. And in the prophets we are near its source and can trace with great clarity its main component parts.

I regard the prophets as men who speak from within the same living tradition of which we ourselves are inheritors—as permanent voices within that tradition. At the same time I regard these insights as only partial insights, sometimes conflicting with one another, constantly needing supplementation, and only finally reaching harmony in Christ, the fulfilment to which they all point. We shall view them, not chiefly from the point of view of their historical interest, or as prognosticators of future events, but as men through whom the Spirit of God is still speaking to the world. As Christians, our eyes will be open to see in them, as in all the Scriptures, ' the things concerning Christ Himself '.

In the pre-critical age the prophets were regarded almost exclusively as foretellers. They had not only foretold the coming of Messiah but had traced out in detail historical events generations after their own day. Thus, it was held, Isaiah of Jerusalem had painted a detailed picture of what would happen on the return from Babylon a hundred-and-fifty years later, as well as having prophesied, in the Immanuel oracle, the virgin birth of our Lord.

The higher criticism of the Liberal period turned away from all this. The prophets were to be viewed as *forth*-tellers, diagnosing the situation of their own day. Each prophetical book or compilation was to be interpreted exclusively against the background of the writer's historical situation. This method of interpretation at least had the merit of putting the prophets back as real men into a real world, a world in many ways very like our own. But these early critics missed two points of importance—they left out the undoubted fact of prophetic ecstasy and they lost the sense of the prophetic fulfilment in Christ. Recently criticism has again come to emphasize the fact of the ecstatic and visionary element in the prophets, but it has still on the whole failed to point to the great culmination and fulfilment of prophecy in Christ. This must be a fundamentally defective view for those who worship a Master who taught His disciples to find in the prophets the things concerning Himself.

But it is very difficult to strike the true balance. There is clearly a difference in kind between some of the typology which is used in St. Matthew, and the fulfilment of the great visions of the Suffering Servant which come to rest in the passion of our Lord. Even Dr. Thornton, who has done so much to bring back the Bible to us as the living word of God to the Church, has sometimes lost himself in the intricacies of an over-detailed typology. What we need is not a pre-critical reversion to an easy acceptance of typology and prevision, but an overmastering conviction of the control of Christ over prophecy as a whole. Liberal criticism has tended to confine the Bible and the Prophets to academic uses. This is termed by Adam Smith ' the prostitution of the prophets '. They are not to be viewed as source books of ancient history and religion, but as the Word of God speaking to all generations, as permanent insights in the total revelation of Christ. It is important to realize how near the prophets actually are to ourselves.

Professor Toynbee has described the attitude of the Victorian Englishman towards history as that of some one living outside history altogether who ' from his privileged state of being emancipated, as he supposed, from history, gazed with curiosity, condescension and a touch of pity, but without apprehension, at the spectacle of less fortunate denizens of other places and periods struggling and foundering in History's flood '. This exactly describes the general attitude of mind of many of the Liberal Protestant critics towards the Bible in general and the prophets in particular. They tended to confine them to academic uses. They

[1] Lecture given to the Bradford Diocesan Clergy School.

viewed them from the easy security of the study or lecture room as interesting examples of a past age remote from our own. And very interesting examples they made of them. I am not for one minute minimizing their achievements in this field of Biblical study. Being placed against an intelligible historic background, the prophets became living characters of very compelling interest: but in a sense their world, though certainly part of our world, was divorced from us. We had reached a kind of vantage point from which we could look back upon the turbulent storms of Samaria and Jerusalem and quietly pass judgment upon them.

Suave, mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis
E terra magnum alterius spectare laborem.

But now, since the two Wars, we see them in a new way as fellow-passengers with us in the same turbulent sea. Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah are our contemporaries, and many of the outstanding historical patterns of their time are recurring on a still larger and more terrifying scale in our own. Just as the dark shadow of Assyria dominated their political horizon, so the dark shadow of Russia lies across Europe to-day, threatening to establish a universal State upon the nations of the West, as Assyria was threatening to do with the petty states of the East. History never repeats itself in detail but recurring patterns do appear and the timeless voice of the same Holy Spirit which spake by the prophets may still be heard speaking through them to us in our own predicament. They are no longer distant voices from a past world, but through them the Word of God is still addressing us and confronting us with decision. That is not to say that they are offering us ready-made solutions. But they are offering us insights into a situation which in many respects is remarkably like their own.

Professor Toynbee has made clear to us that in actual fact all history is in a sense contemporary. Measured in terms not of self-contained national histories but of civilizations (the latest of which he says is only three generations old) and set against the time-span of the cosmological, geological and biological past, civilizations that have emerged in the second millennium B.C. (like the Graeco-Roman) or in the fourth millennium B.C. (like the Egyptian) or in the first millennium of the contemporaries indeed! This gives us a new view-point on the prophets. We can say of them as Toynbee says of Thucydides, 'I was re-reading him now with a new perception—perceiving meanings in his words and feeling behind his phrases to which I was insensible until I, in my time, had run into that historical crisis which had inspired him to write his work. His present, in fact, had been my future.' If this is true, the prophets may well, once again, become for us the very voice of God, speaking to the Church to-day, and not just interesting ancient history. In fact there is a continuity between them and us even greater than Toynbee perceives. For him (albeit comparatively contemporaries of ours) they are representatives of a civilization at one remove from us and one of the direct parents of our own. For us they are actual members of the same community, the Church of the Living God. They are not, from this view-point, our fathers but our elder brothers, addressing themselves to the self-same community as our own. For the Old and the New Israel, the people of the Old and New Covenants, are in a sense one people.

Abraham, Moses, David and Isaiah, are in actual fact our own elder brothers—their history is our history if regarded at the deepest level of all—that of the calling and the promises of God. Indeed without a sense of the continuity between the two Covenants much of the reading of the Old Testament in church becomes indefensible and unintelligible. Why, after all, should we bother about the history of the wandering Aramaean? But the binding up of the Old Testament with the New in the Christian Bible is symbolic of a deep insight. The people of both Covenants are of the same family; we are the children of the prophets.

And how great the prophets are. They are a cure for all that von Hügel used to call 'fustiness' in religion. A great deal of what is called religion to-day is too specifically religious. The world thinks of religion as concerned exclusively with church services and saying our prayers, with Sunday-school morality, and dismisses it as remote from life. We ourselves, as priests, are all too apt to fall into the same mistake, and to measure our success or failure by the number of people we can get to church. Religious books and the religious press often give the same one-sided impression. So much of life is left out. Religion becomes a specialized interest for those who like that kind of thing. Nature and supernature fall apart. This is one of the greatest weaknesses of the Church in the parishes to-day.

Now the prophets are the great correctors of all this. They claim the whole world as God's field, and in them the winds of God are blowing from the heights. They find God's hand in most unlikely places—in the market-place, in the great cataclysms of history, and in the daily contacts of man with man. They see the world of Nature as well as the world of Grace as God's world. We priests, with our perfectly legitimate preoccupation with the world of grace, are in constant danger of falling into a narrowly professional view of life. But if we allow our minds to be moulded by the prophets we shall be far less likely to fall into this one-sidedness. For the prophets,

religion is never a matter of abstract ideas. They are too closely in touch with everyday things for that. Their message is the outcome of their contact with actual facts and affairs. Theology, with them, is never abstract but always the outcome of the interpenetration of the actual world of events by the Word of God.

Not only as heirs of the work of the critics but also from the actual situation of the world to-day we are in a far better position than perhaps any subsequent age to understand their message. For we, like them, are living in one of the greatest cataclysms of history. In many fundamental respects we are nearer to the age of Amos than to the world of our own grandfathers. And so we can hear the prophets' message with greater distinctness, as deep calleth to deep. And what wonderful guidance they offer to our need. In an age like theirs and ours when the fountains of the great deep are being broken up, men are in danger of becoming fatalists. The forces unleashed seem so overwhelming that no pattern is easily discernible beneath the events. In such a situation it is easy to yield up all moral questions in despair.

It is the greatness of the prophets that they see steadily the moral issues underlying the cataclysm. In face of the terrible menace of heathen Assyria which hung over their existence, the prophets found the root cause of the situation to lie not in the economic nor the political but in the moral field. The reason for Assyria's advance was not, according to them, the pressure of population, or food supplies within the Empire itself, or the ruthless desire for glory or dominion, or the attempt to overcome and annihilate the Egyptian Empire and establish a universal State. All these motives actually did play a part in the total situation, but it is not to any of them that the prophets point. No, they boldly state that the reason for the Assyrian attack was that Yahweh, the God of Israel, had Himself raised Assyria up as His instrument to punish His own people for falling short of His moral and spiritual demands, and that He would not turn it back. In spite of their belief that Israel was Yahweh's chosen people, they did not, as do the partisans of both sides to-day, point out the terrible evil and sinfulness of the enemy and portray their own country as exemplary and peace-loving. They levelled their criticisms against themselves and their own country. ' You only have I known of all the families of the earth—therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities.'

In spite of the universal belief that a national God was himself involved in the victory or defeat of his own people and that he could not himself exist without his people, they faced, in certain moods, the possibility of the utter extinction of the nation, and traced it to the very hand of Yahweh Himself. ' The eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth.'

Here was an utterly revolutionary belief. God was the God of righteousness as well as the God of Israel, and He was more concerned with the establishment of ethical righteousness than with the establishment of His own nation apart from it. This insight alone (though there are many others of similar importance) justifies the late Professor Whitehead's statement that ' the Hebrew prophets constitute one of the few groups of men who decisively altered history in any intimate sense. Most spectacular upheavals merely replace one set of individuals with another analogous set ; so that history is mostly but a barren change of name. But the Hebrew prophets really produced a decisive qualitative alteration, and, what is still more rare, a change for the better.'

This doctrine, however it may have omitted many important factors in the total situation, and however it may have been modified later by the idea of the righteous Remnant, did succeed in putting first things first and enabled Israel ultimately to survive the Exile and to become the matrix of the Christian Church. It taught a lesson which is far from being learned to-day, that it is on the moral rather than on the economic or political level that the ultimate destiny of men and nations is decided. To-day it is all too readily assumed that our main problems are those of science and technology, and that the issue will be decided on these levels. The Marxists tell us that the real driving forces of the world are economic, but the prophets are still there to teach us that the real issues are to be looked for at a still deeper level, and are always moral and spiritual ones. That at least is a ' message for to-day '.

Our world to-day is in the process of unification, and there is no possibility of turning it back. Western science and techniques recognize no boundaries. They are spreading through Africa, China, India as well as through Russia, and producing unification everywhere on the technical level. There is no hesitation on the part of these peoples to cast away their past cultures and westernize themselves on the technical and economic level. They ' have seen the electric light in the West and are come to worship '. But we have not given them the deeper levels of our culture—the ethics and religion out of which these technical achievements sprang.

Partly because it is so much easier to teach and to assimilate technical facilities than moral and spiritual truth, but still more because the West itself had lost its faith before it became the apostle of these technical know-hows to other races, there

has been an utterly disastrous treason of the intelligentsia with results that are only too obvious in the tottering world of to-day. The voice of the prophets insistently recalls us to the deeper levels. It is only at the level of a common morality and a common faith that a true unification can be found. Ethics and religion are the fundamental realities on which everything else depends. Our difficulties are primarily moral and spiritual ones, though we have persisted lately in thinking that they are scientific. That is the message of the prophets and that is the message which the Church must incessantly proclaim. As Toynbee says, 'In studying history as a whole our precept should be to relegate political and economic history to a subordinate place and give religious history the primacy. For religion, after all, is the serious business of human life.'

But we must never think of the prophets as mere moralists. They did not appear as exponents of a system of conduct. They pointed back not to a moral code but to the acts of Yahweh, and they based the moral standard which was being transgressed by Israel on the character of Yahweh Himself. In spite of the fact that they sometimes seem to desire the total abolition of sacrifice and the cultus, they cannot be claimed as supporters of a merely ethical religion. The righteousness which they preached was the righteousness of the Living God whose mouthpiece they were. They warn us against two common mistakes: the mistake of regarding ethical conduct as irrelevant to religion, and the contrary mistake of regarding conduct alone as relevant, without religion. Their own contemporaries were more inclined to fall into the first mistake; we are more commonly given to the second; but both errors are ever recurring dangers in many subtle forms, and the prophets stand guardian, at the very source of our religious tradition, against both mistakes. Never since they taught has it been possible in principle to divorce religion from conduct, nor can those whose minds are formed under their teaching about the Living God ever be satisfied with a merely ethical faith.

The extraction of the ethical teaching of Jesus Himself from His total claims is not only untrue to the gospel, but it is contrary to the whole previous tradition which lies behind the gospel. An ethical system can never so to speak stand on its own feet but must be rooted back in a personal relationship with God. The best working out of this balance in modern terms that I know is the late Professor A. E. Taylor's Gifford Lectures, *The Faith of a Moralist.* Now the prophets' belief in the living God sprang from two sources—first from the acts of Yahweh in the past history of Israel, in particular the events of the Exodus when He has shown His hand; secondly in their own personal call as prophets. We have in the case of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah allusions to the call. 'Yahweh took me from following the flock', says Amos, 'and said to me, "Go, prophesy to my people Israel".' What a depth of personal encounter lies behind these simple words. With Hosea it was through the marriage difficulties of his own life that God called him, 'when Yahweh spake first with Hosea'. In Isaiah's case we have a far more detailed account, the Temple vision through which his overwhelming call came. With Jeremiah it was a continual struggle. 'Ah, Lord God, behold I cannot speak, for I am a child . . . but if I say, I will not make mention of him nor speak any more in his name, then there is in my heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I cannot contain.'

In each case we see the invasion of the personality of man by the personal Spirit of God. It is for that reason that the prophetic approach is so deeply personalist. Their whole being, and not a part only, is involved in their response. 'The essential thing about man,' says Martin Buber, 'is his capacity for being addressed. The answer to that has to be given not by the mind alone, but by the whole self.' That quotation exactly describes the prophets' response, and it is the essential attitude of all deep religion, which consists of call and response, the Divine-human encounter.

There is of course another approach to reality—the 'It' relation, as Buber terms it. This is an entirely necessary and, within its limits, a valid approach. On it all our science, and even our psychologies are based. It is the peculiar danger of a scientific age that the lower 'It category' should be employed as the *only* valid one. It is this that rules out religion altogether and speaks of it as a lower or reversionary attitude. But actually the *Thou*-relation is the *higher*, not the lower category. And the use of the higher category does not rule out the lower category, though the taking of the lower as ultimate does rule out the higher. But as F. H. Bradley said, 'He who seeks a richer experience than that given by religion knows not what he asks'.

The prophets stand, for all time, as exponents of a higher and richer relationship on the personal level with reality. They unashamedly assume the principle which is the highest category of all. A scientific age has very much to learn from them here. No one would be so foolish as to question the tremendous achievements of science, but the scientific attitude, though yielding wonderful results, has tended to develop man's intellect at the expense of the rest of his nature, which in the actual living of life, is engaged at still deeper levels, levels of personal confrontations. In the

life of the soul the mental discipline of scientific thinking (the It-relationship) is excellent as a kind of mental purgative or purification, but as a final vision of the end of life it is utterly disastrous.

In their absorption in the personal relationship of man with man and man with God, the prophets are a constant reminder of the need for what, I suppose, would be called to-day 'existential thinking'. This personal meeting with God, this call at the deepest levels of the soul which we see in the prophets, is given a still deeper personal meaning in Christ. For in Christ we meet a Person whom we know, a God who has revealed Himself to us personally in a human life. The call of Christ is the call of a well-known voice, as when He pronounced Mary's name at the Tomb, or when He answered Paul, 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest'. In that confrontation with Christ, from which all true Christian experience springs, we reach the deepest level of all. The call of Yahweh to the prophets to prophesy, and the call of Jesus to us to discipleship, is the same voice, only in Jesus it has reached greater clarity.

Contributions and Comments

Μορφή in Philippians ii. 6

The Rev. J. M. Furness (The Expository Times, lxix. [Dec. 1957], 93–94) raises the possibility of interpreting Ph 2^{6-11} against the background of the Second Adam doctrine. This possibility is further strengthened by a consideration of the phrase *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ* (*v.* 6) in the light of recent interpretation.

The older commentators discussed the word 'form' (*μορφή*) as a philosophical term, and Lightfoot reaches the conclusion that *μορφή* 'is used (in the text of Ph 2) in a sense substantially the same which it bears in Greek philosophy.'[1]

In recent years there seems to be a consensus of opinion that *μορφή* is to be understood as equivalent to *εἰκών* (image). If this is so, it has an important bearing on both the background of the Christological section and the Apostle's categories of thought.

It is proposed that the Hebrew *dᵉmûth* (Aramaic *dᵉmutha'*) underlies both *μορφή* and *εἰκών*. The Aramaic term is important if the section was originally composed by an author whose mother tongue was Semitic as E. Lohmeyer has suggested.[2] The credit for the development of this linguistic connection between *μορφή* and *εἰκών* apparently goes to J. Héring,[3] and has been accepted by a number of interpreters.[4] Héring points out, moreover, that the word *çalma'* (Heb. *çelem*) which is rendered in the LXX of Dn 3^{19} by *μορφή* also occurs in its Hebrew equivalent in the pronouncement of Gn 1^{26}: 'Let us make man in our image (*çelem*, LXX *κατ' εἰκόνα*), after our likeness (*dᵉmûth*).' Here 'image' and 'likeness' appear as synonymous terms, and this confirms the view that *μορφή* and *εἰκών* may be regarded as equally interchangeable in the context of Ph 2.

Two small points may be submitted as confirmation of this equivalence. In the *Epistle to Diognetus* 2^{3} the MSS read *ἔτι καὶ νῦν* which poses a difficulty for the translator. K. Lake translates: 'Before they were moulded by their arts into the shapes which they have (*εἰς τὴν μορφὴν τούτων*), was it not possible, and does it not still remain possible (*ἔτι καὶ νῦν*), for each of them to have been given a different shape (*μεταμεμορφωμένον*)?[5]

The general sense of the passage which is a derisive polemic against idols is clear, but the text, as H. G. Meecham allows, is corrupt and difficult.[6] For this reason Lachmann, followed by E. H. Blakeney,[7] offers the conjecture *εἰκάζειν* for *ἔτι καὶ νῦν*, and this gives the better sense. 'Was it not possible, before they were moulded in this shape by these various craftsmen, to make each one of them, through a change of form, resemble (*εἰκάζειν*) utensils such as these (*αὐτῶν*)?' On this reading the meaning is that a change of form leads directly to a new resemblance; and *μορφή* and *εἰκών* (in verb forms) have a common meaning.

The second observation is based on L. H. Brockington's investigation into the use of *δόξα* in the LXX. Noting that Gn 1^{27} is directly quoted in 1 Co 11^{7} (man is 'the image and glory of God') he comments that 'it may well be that *δόξα* is here virtually a synonym of *εἰκών* seeing that *δόξα* translates *tᵉmunah* "form" in Nu 12^{8} and Ps 17 $(16)^{15}$.'[8] To this fact may be added the

[1] *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* [1896], 132.

[2] *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. ii.* 5–11 [1928], 8–9.

[3] *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue* [1937], 162 ff.

[4] For example, A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors* [1940], 49; P. Bonnard, *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens* [1950], 43; O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* [1957], 180 ff.

[5] *The Apostolic Fathers*, ii. [1913], *ad loc.*

[6] *The Epistle to Diognetus* [1949], 98–99.

[7] *The Epistle to Diognetus* [1943], 37.

[8] 'The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament use of *δόξα*' in *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham [1955], 2.

relevant detail that *t*^{e}*munah* is also found in Job 4[16] where the LXX translates by μορφή. If μορφή and εἰκών are closely related to the notion of δόξα as these references seem to indicate, it opens up the way for a fruitful consideration of the meaning of ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (the participle is found also in 1 Co 11[7]); and remembering that the term δόξα conveys the idea of brightness, it may be proposed that the glory of the heavenly Christ who is the true image of God (both pre-existent and post-resurrection) was that which made the Apostle's experience on the Damascus road so memorable (Gal 1[15-16], 2 Co 4[6], Ac 9[3] 22[6. 11] 26[13]).

The conception of the Lord Jesus Christ as the image and glory of God is attested Pauline teaching (2 Co 4[4], Col 1[15] and possibly 1 Co 11[7], Col 3[10]). If we may add Ph 2[6] as a further illustration of this teaching,[1] it suggests a parallel between the two Adams. The first Adam who was created in God's likeness (Gn 1[26-27]) sought to grasp at equality with God (Gn 3[5]), and through pride and disobedience lost the glorious image of his Maker.[2] The last Adam, however, as the heavenly man (1 Co 15[47]), existing in the true likeness of God,[3] humbled Himself in obedience, and accepted the status of a slave, *i.e.*, the slave *par excellence*, the Servant of the Lord.[4] He resisted the temptation to which the first Adam succumbed, namely, the arrogant assertion of rivalry to God, and chose the path of meekness and submission which led Him to the Cross. His obedience to death is the all-important factor in the whole drama. It reverses Adam's primal disobedience (Ro 5[15ff.]), and leads on directly (διὸ καὶ [*v.* 9]) to His exaltation and sovereign function as Lord. The angelic worship which the first Adam forfeited, and the universal dominion promised to him, are restored to the obedient last Adam (*vv.* 10–11).

R. P. MARTIN

Dunstable

[1] So J. Behm, *T.W.z.N.T.*, iv. 759, who takes μορφὴ θεοῦ as completely corresponding to the pre-existent glory of Jn 17[5].

[2] For Rabbinical speculations about this glory which Adam derived from God and forfeited by his fall see W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* [1948], 46.

[3] Here εἰκών must be given its full significance. As a Biblical word it means, not simply a copy or a reflection of an original, but the visible manifestation or 'objectivisation' of the essence of the original. Cf. Héring, *op. cit.*, 164–165; C. Masson, *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens* [1950], on Col 1[15] (pp. 98–99).

[4] The intimate connection between the Servant passages in Isaiah and Ph 2 is brought out by most modern exegetes. Cf., for a full analysis, L. Cerfaux, *Le Christ dans la théologie de Saint Paul* [1954], 284 ff. Cf. also the suggestive insights in H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Cross in the Old Testament* [1955 ed.], 103–105.

The Golden Rule

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxix. 304 [July, 1958], Professor B. M. Metzger inquires about the origin of the phrase 'The Golden Rule' as applied to Mt 7[12]. The following quotation from John Wesley's tenth sermon on the Sermon on the Mount (first published in 1750) may help:

'This is that royal law, that golden rule of mercy, as well as justice, which even the heathen Emperor caused to be written over the gate of his palace'.

Whether Wesley himself coined the phrase or was using an already popular designation, I do not know.

HAROLD A. GUY

Southampton

ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα

IN the second of his collected papers in *New Testament Studies* [1952] Professor Dodd discusses the second fragment of the *Unknown Gospel*, in which occur the words, 'the hour of his arrest had not yet come'. In his comment Professor Dodd refers to 'the conception of the divinely ordained "hour", which controls the scheme of the Fourth Gospel'.

On 1st July 1954 I came back to Jerusalem from a visit to the Gaza Strip. Leaving the UNO Plane at Kalandia I made my way to the waiting car and slipped in beside the driver, who, I noticed, was wearing dark glasses. We exchanged the customary salutations; but I thought him unusually quiet, though he was obviously scrutinizing me from behind the glasses. A few minutes elapsed and he launched into conversation. After the first sentences, he said, 'You are the *Qassis* (minister) who was hurt at the Jaffa Gate in January 1948'. At my surprised assent, he went on, 'And you were taken away from Jerusalem on April 15th in an ambulance'. More astonished I asked how he could know. His answer was simple. 'I was the chauffeur who drove the ambulance to Lydda'. We shook hands, the while I said, 'And going up over Sheikh Jarrah, the Jews shot at us and the bullet struck the woodwork over your head'. 'Yes, yes,' the driver remarked laconically, '*walākin mā kān waqtī 'issa*' ('but my time was not yet'). *Issa* (at the hour) is the modern corruption of *as-Sa'at*. It was worth months of suffering to listen six years later to another echo of the Master's (Johannine) voice on the lips of a twentieth-century Palestinian. 'Mine hour has not yet come.' 'Father, the hour is come.'

ERIC F. F. BISHOP

Redhill, Surrey

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

In This Sign, Conquer !

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'. . . not to know any thing . . . save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.'—1 Co 2^2.

Like you, I learned at school the deaf and dumb alphabet, spelling letters on my fingers so that no master could hear. And until the other evening I quite thought that was how deaf and dumb people held conversations. But then I listened to a lecture by an interpreter for deaf and dumb people, and he told us that the finger alphabet was much too slow for practical conversations, and that dumb people use hundreds of signs, each of which represents a whole word.

Moving the first two fingers down the palm of the other hand means 'walk'. Drawing the edge of the right hand across the outstretched left palm means 'bread' (just as if you were cutting a loaf), and rubbing the first finger of the right hand across the left palm means 'butter' (it looks as though you are spreading it). Make the sign of a pointed beard and put a finger at each corner of your mouth, and you are saying 'French'.

Then the interpreter held up three fingers of his left hand, passed his right hand over them, and pointed above with his right forefinger. None of us could guess what that meant. It was the sign for God. I have read learned books which have taken hundreds of pages to explain less successfully than that what we mean by the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

Last of all, he held out his left palm and prodded it with his right forefinger, and then reversed the action, prodding his right palm with his left forefinger. 'That,' he said, 'is our sign for Jesus. We try to represent reverently the mark of the nails.' From now on, whenever I come across a dumb person overcoming the terrible obstacle of lack of speech, I shall remember that he conquers by signs as meaningful as that—and he will preach a sermon to me in that way.

Tradition says that Constantine at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge in A.D. 312 had a vision of the Cross and heard the challenge: 'In this sign, conquer!' He vowed that, if he won the battle, he would make the Roman Empire Christian. He did win, and he did carry out his promise as far as he could. But history has taught us that you cannot make an empire Christian by command, even though you place (as Constantine did) the sign of the Cross on your soldiers' helmets.

The real meaning of Easter is the lesson Constantine never learned—that victory comes through self-forgetful love. The Lord we serve is One who came, not to be waited on, but to wait on others and to give His life as the liberty-price for many.

Hindu legend tells of a desperate famine in India. The fields were bare because there had been no rain, and people died from lack of food. The lovely princess went to see for herself the sufferings of her people, and they filled her with compassion. In their superstition and agony the simple peasants told her that there was a curse on the land, and some worthy person must die in order to remove it. That night, she ordered her men to dig a grave, and when all was quiet she crept into it herself and covered herself with the soil. In the morning the peasants found a fountain of pure water gushing from her heart, which brought life and freshness to the land.

St. Paul knew that the good news of Christ crucified could become for the men of the pagan city of Corinth—as it is for us—the news of love's conquest.

Sunbeam

By Principal J. Ithel Jones, M.A., B.D., The Baptist College, Cardiff

'What did you learn in Sunday School to-day, Freddie?' asked mother as he came bounding in. 'Oh,' said Freddie, 'some silly song about "Jesus wants me for a sunbeam".' 'Well, what's silly about that?' 'Well, I want to be a bus-driver!'

Of course, Freddie had got it wrong. He thought the one cut out the other. Which it doesn't, of course. It's not a case of 'either or', but 'both and'. Freddie could be a bus-driver and a sunbeam for Jesus at the same time.

We don't need to shut ourselves away from the world, like monks in a monastery, in order to be sunbeams. There is the famous story about a girl who was asked in Sunday School what a saint is. She answered, 'A man that the light shines through.' What had happened was that the girl from her pew in church could see the sunbeams shining through the stained-glass window which carried a picture of St. Andrew.

The light of God must shine through us to people 'at work, at school, at play', as the hymn puts

it. There are people in our congregation who work in offices. That can be very tiresome at times. But when others are impatient and cantankerous these good people remain quiet and patient. They are secretaries and sunbeams!

Others, who have quite exacting jobs to do by day, when evening comes go out to visit the sick and bring cheer to lonely lives. The light of God shines through them.

And when boys and girls are helpful at home and refuse to have anything to do with mean tricks which even youngsters get up to sometimes they are sunbeams in a very true sense.

Freddie did not want to be a sunbeam because he had an ambition to be a bus-driver. I very much hope he will grow up to be both.

The Christian Year

Easter Day

The Ever-Changing Forms of Christ

By the Reverend Robert Menzies, D.D., Glasgow

'After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.' —Mk 16^{12}.

We read in Mark's Gospel that Jesus appeared in another form to two of His disciples as they journeyed toward Emmaus. When they conveyed to the other disciples at Jerusalem the news of this appearance, it was received with incredulity. 'Neither believed they them.' The point on which the sacred writer wishes to lay the emphasis was the changing forms of our Lord's risen life. It was not the essential Christ that was changing but merely the form in which He appeared to them. Nothing is more striking than the number and variety of these post-Easter appearances, and not a single one of them conforms to any fixed or stereotyped pattern.

Indeed, He assumed so many and unfamiliar shapes that very few of those to whom He appeared recognized Him in the first instance for what He was. Mary on the first Easter morning supposed Him to be the gardener; Philip, a phantom ghost; the disciples at the Sea of Galilee regarded the stranger on the shore as a fish merchant, while Cleopas and his friend looked upon Him as a stranger in Jerusalem. The unfamiliar form blurred their awareness of His identity. There is a truth here of permanent value which we could with profit lay well to heart. The truth here is that those ever-changing forms of the living Christ represent a permanent feature of His revelation to the souls of men. He changes His form to meet a changing human need. He adapts Himself to our life-situations. While it is true that in one sense Christ never changes, being 'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever', in another sense it is equally true that the expressions of His unchanging life are Protean in form.

'He appeared in another form.' How true in the first instance is this claim in *the light of the New Testament itself.* The writers of the New Testament documents have in point of fact no one uniform, self-contained, and comprehensive doctrine of the Person of Christ. Paul speaks about the 'many-coloured wisdom' of the gospel, and Jesus appears there under many shapes and guises. Each of the Synoptic Gospels is different from the other in respect of its angle of interpretation. The Matthew Jesus is predominantly the fulfiller of prophecy; in Mark He is the prophet mighty in word and deed; in Luke it is the universal element in Christ's gospel that is stressed, His universal Saviourhood. In the Fourth Gospel we have an entirely different portrait of Christ. This writer represents Christ as 'the incarnate Glory' the God-Man manifest in flesh, with all that that implies. James sees in Christ's gospel the royal law, while John in his Epistles sees in Christ the Incarnate Love which is the fulfilment of all law. In the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is represented as appearing to men as the Pioneer of 'a new and living way' to God the Father, while the writer of the Apocalypse represents Christ as the King of kings and Lord of lords, as the Maker of the new heavens and the new earth. Paul, on the other hand, has a point of view distinctively his own which focuses our thoughts more directly on the redemptive aspects of Christ's work. Christ appeared in a different form to all these representative writers, and this is our authority for taking broad views of Christ's revelation, and making room in our thinking for different interpretations of His work and Person.

'He appeared in another form.' This distinctive feature of Christ's risen life should encourage us to expect not only different views of Christ's Person but also *varieties of religious experience.* And that is true in two directions. The same man at different stages of his development from infancy to maturity will need a different kind of Christ. The Christ that satisfies the child will not satisfy the grown man, and least of all the aged. 'When thou shalt be old . . . another shall gird thee, and carry thee.' Again not only will the approach of Christ to the changing need of the developing man be different but the developed religious consciousness of the mature will vary in kind. Each mature man will seek in Christ something that corresponds to and answers the deepest need of his nature.

' And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.'

The artist will find in Christ One who (to quote a phrase of Tertullian) is ' the diadem of beauty '. The intellectual will find in Him One in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. The lonely and the broken will find in Him ' the friend that sticketh closer than a brother '. Those who feel their lives empty and purposeless will find One who comes to them with the offer of a life worth living and a cause worth serving. The beaten path to Christ will probably be along the line of moral failure. He will come to the morally defeated in the guise of a Saviour from sin and the Giver of new life. The availability of Christ to meet the changing needs of human nature is guaranteed by this peculiarity of His risen life. It is also a warning against the tendency to cast religious experience into a fixed and unalterable mould. We must avoid the error of supposing that any other experience that differs from ours is a defective or even a false experience. Each of the different forms in which Christ appears to different men and women is an authentic religious experience, and we must broaden our outlook to include that fact. The one fatal error to avoid is the one the residue of the disciples in Jerusalem made, who, when they were told by Cleopas that Christ had appeared to him and his friend ' in another form ' greeted the intelligence with stubborn incredulity.

' He appeared in another form.' This claim is our warrant for believing that the living Christ appears in different form to successive generations of men. Each historical epoch of the Christian era has viewed Christ from its own angle. The revelation of Christ which each period of history has set forth has been largely conditioned by the prevailing standards and needs of its time. So we have at different periods the Christ of history, the Christ of experience, the Christ of speculation, the Christ of romance, the Christ of authority, the Christ of personal redemption, the Christ of social salvation. He is appearing ' in another form ' to our own age. ' He is,' as Matthew Arnold said, ' our great Contemporary.' Nay, He is more. As Luke reminds us in the Emmaus incident, ' he made as if he would go further '. That is what He is always doing, going on ahead, the Creator and inspirer of secular as well as religious change. We are all apt to forget that the Lord we worship is as deeply involved in the secular order of the world as we are. We are apt to forget that the perturbations and upheavals of our modern age are not merely under Christ's control but are often initiated by Him. It is another of the forms in which He is appearing to the sons of men. Some of the familiar patterns of our modern age—such as aggressive nationalism, self-determination, a classless materialistic society—such corporate expressions may seem to us remote from and even hostile to the spirit of Christ. But we should not lightly assume that such is the case. It may very well be that this is merely one of our Lord's unfamiliar post-Easter guises. How can we be sure of this ? Are there any tests we can apply to validate this claim ? I suggest that there are three contained in the Emmaus incident itself. (1) ' He opened to them the Scriptures.' That is, the events of to-day must be capable of a spiritual interpretation and lead to a spiritual issue. (2) ' He was known of them in the breaking of bread.' That is to say that they will have an outcome in love and brotherhood, and share in the spirit of sacrifice. (3) ' They went and told it to the residue.' That is to say that a genuinely Christ-inspired movement will be suffused with missionary passion. Only if those notes are present can we confidently say that Christ through them is appearing ' in another form '.

LOW SUNDAY

On the Road

BY THE REVEREND H. HOWARD WILLIAMS, B.D., Ph.D., LONDON

' Our own hope was that he would be the redeemer of Israel ; but he is dead. . . .'—Lk 24[21] (Moffatt).

D. H. Lawrence in one of his essays reminds us that one day long ago chaos tried to redescend upon the earth, but it couldn't because Noah was afloat in the ark with all the animals. There came a horrifying deluge and the swirling waters of the flood and all that had seemed good even to the eyes of God was about to be destroyed forever—but Noah was in the ark with all the animals. There came a time when darkness descended upon the face of the whole earth and there was no light of day, for even the sun had been blotted out—but Jesus came and walked on the Emmaus road and there was light. Calvary meant for the disciples the end of all hope—our own hope was that He would be the Redeemer—but He is dead. The story of Jesus from Christmas to Easter is of the struggle between darkness and light and there is no light even at Christmas but the light which shines from an empty tomb. Not Noah in the ark with all the animals but Jesus dead and buried yet alive for evermore. Death has no more dominion for here is life which could not be stopped at the crib or the Cross or the grave.

It could not be stopped at birth. ' Our own hope was that he would be the redeemer.' What a hope indeed ! Do not be surprised at their despair, but wonder that this life had not been destroyed in

the cradle. Men tried to stop it at birth like exposing an unwanted child. There was no room at the inn—and Herod sent forth and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem. So they went to Egypt, the story tells us, coming back to Nazareth only when there was a commanding word and even then with care and by stealth. But let them pursue and harass this little family as they wished they couldn't stop the life.

We understand these forces well for they are with us to this day, the enemies of life and hope. A bad environment—so we say, and it stands for the ugly powers which would throttle a young life before it has a chance to grow. The iron grip of circumstance—so we say, and the deluge seems to matter more than the ark and the names of Herod and Archelaus more than the baby Jesus. Displaced persons—so we say, and the people driven like cattle from their own homes seem to matter not at all.

Yet when Jesus was born the ways of gods and men had failed and men yearned for a Redeemer. Soldiers were on the march enlarging the frontiers of their overlords and Olympus was overcrowded with gods urging their claims. But there were faithful people waiting amid all the wild welter of the world. There was Mary, the hand-maiden of the Lord, who was to nourish this life within the warmth of her womb however fiercely the heathen might rage. There was Simeon, a devout man, on the look-out for the Consolation of Israel. There were shepherds in the darkness watching over their sheep—they who had cared for the birth of so many lambs would be early to greet the Lamb of God. Away in a far country there were Wise Men —and chaos couldn't redescend because these men were ready to venture into the unknown. This life couldn't be stopped at birth—nor yet at the Cross.

It could not be stopped at the Cross. 'Our own hope was . . . but he is dead.' What more dreadful and certain way could there be of ending a man's life and influence? Paul indeed recommends this way in order to deal finally with the flesh and the evil powers of the world. Nail this evil thing to the Cross—so he says—however much it writhes and struggles—fasten it there. The ancient world, indeed, would boast that this was a sure way of ending the ways of wicked men, and to prove the point crosses were lifted up on public ways with the flesh of men nailed on them.

This is what they did with Jesus. They fixed Him and then stood back to look at a living Man who couldn't lift a finger to help Himself. 'He saved others . . . let Christ descend now from the Cross.' Thomas couldn't believe that Jesus could break away from that place nor could he forget the nails. The nails, the nails—I must see the print of the nails and seeing them he believed, yet couldn't believe.

Yet although Jesus was fixed to the Cross, He was free. He was free because He was doing what He came to do and what God wanted Him to do. He was naked and nailed but free! He was doing not only what God wanted Him to do but God was doing it with Him. 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.' Listen to the words of Simone Weil—'He whose soul remains ever turned in the direction of God while the nail pierces it, finds himself nailed on to the very centre of the universe.'

So it was that Christians took the Cross from the hill outside a city wall and carried it in singing procession to the centre of their cities, covering it with jewels and making it a thing of beauty. And yet other Christians, not carrying a cross, sang about it with a simple enthusiasm they could scarcely understand—

> At the Cross! at the Cross!
> Where I first saw the light.

It couldn't be stopped at the Cross but because of the Cross the love in the heart of God was sent shining into the world.

It could not be stopped at the grave. Strangle and crucify this life—bury it in a tomb without a door. Seal the tomb and set a guard. This is the end, for never since the world began has a man been born in a grave. 'It was our hope . . . but he is dead.' So they walked and were sad until another came and walked with them. They told Him all about Jesus of Nazareth—a great man and a good man taken by wicked hands and crucified. 'All about Jesus of Nazareth'—no, not all about Him because they had forgotten about the prophets and where the story began. They thought the story began with Bethlehem but it began in the beginning with God. 'In the beginning was the word . . . and the word became flesh'—and now the living Word and the Christ of God was with them on the Emmaus road and their eyes were opened at the evening meal when He broke the bread.

'The world was growing old and not even Cæsar could make it young again'—No! But Jesus could and into their sadness there came unspeakable joy. D. H. Lawrence said in that essay that the adventure has gone out of the Christian faith —and he, too, was sad.

You, too, may feel that the story is over—that the adventure is at an end. Come now and sit at this meal prepared for us that in the breaking of the bread we may see Him as He walks along the road we must take—the Lord is risen indeed! Chaos cannot redescend for we are on an adventure with the Lord of life and death.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Jesus and a Problem about the Future Life

BY THE REVEREND HAROLD G. NEWSHAM, M.A., HARTFORD, CONN., U.S.A.

'Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err . . .' —Mt 22^{29-32}.

The question the Sadducees asked was the kind of question we commonly call a poser. They asked the Master if He would be good enough to explain who would be the husband in the life to come of a certain much married lady—possibly a notorious widow of the time—none of whose seven husbands survived for any considerable period their wedding day.

It was a crude and clumsy question enough. Yet it does raise a problem which troubles most of us, if not all of us, at one time or another. It puts in an extreme form our common difficulty of imagining how life, that is full and sentient and personal, can possibly continue under non-physical conditions. So we are grateful that Jesus took this question seriously, and gave to it a profound and memorable answer. It was an answer which comprised three distinct points, as important and valid to-day as at the moment of their utterance nineteen centuries ago.

1. The first point was that *the sceptics were over-estimating our human powers of foresight.* They were assuming that because thus far in our existence life is experienced only in a physical framework, therefore no other kind of life is possible.

Such an assumption, of course, is difficult to avoid. We can only reason and imagine from past and present experience. Yet over and over again we find that arguments and forecasts based upon what has been hitherto, and what is at the moment, can be ridiculously wide of the mark. There is scarcely a single scientific invention, now a commonplace of experience, which wasn't proved to the complete satisfaction of the best brains of the time to be quite impossible. That great philosopher Bacon, says McNeile Dixon, 'could not to the last believe that the earth revolved around the sun'. It was incredible. The diamond appears the acme of stability; it is in fact a whirlpool of furious motions. Who could believe it? What is credible? Only the familiar. When an Act of Parliament was sought for the first experimental railroad in England, medical experts solemnly testified in the House of Commons that the human frame could not possibly stand up to the terrible strain and stress which the fantastic speed of thirty miles an hour would induce.

Similarly in social life, every new departure has always been proven beforehand, on the basis of the familiar and the established, to be hare-brained, impossible. A social order which did not rest upon a broad base of slavery was once inconceivable to the best brains of our world.

What it comes to is this. Our human wisdom is all too seldom wise before the event. Modesty and humility should be the mark of true wisdom. If we did not know by actual experience that the acorn yields the mighty oak, there is no power of logic, of foresight, or of imagination within the human mind which could have predicted so dramatic a development by any examination whatsoever of the acorn.

This, then, in substance, is the first rapier-edged point in the reply of Jesus to the Sadducees. 'You are assuming that there cannot be life except under precisely the same bodily conditions as the present one. But in this you do greatly err. A great surprise awaits you.'

2. The next thrust in the answer of Jesus is more pointed still. *The sceptics were guilty of under-estimating the powers and resources of God.* Their first mistake was one of logic. Their second was one of religion. 'A future life unbelievable', exclaims McNeile Dixon again. 'Nay, I should myself put the matter rather differently. The present life is incredible; a future credible. To be alive, actually existing, to have emerged from darkness and silence, to be here to-day is certainly incredible. A future life would be a miracle, and you find it difficult to believe in miracles? I, on the contrary, find it easy. They are to be expected. The starry worlds in space and time, the pageant of life, the processes of growth and reproduction, the inventiveness of Nature, the rising and setting sun, the character of thought, of will, intuition, consciousness, these singly and together plunge the human mind into profound amazement to be in their midst. . . . Miracles! . . . Miracles are not rare birds. They fly in flocks.'

The wonder of this life here and now. The mighty acts of God recorded in the history of our race, and supremely in the Scriptures of the Hebrew and the Christian faiths. All this, when it kindles into a blazing fire within the soul, should remove the idea of impossibility from the worshipping mind. The more we realize the supernatural in the so-called natural of the present, the more natural it is to believe that what may, at the moment, seem impossible to us is elementary to God. So Jesus gravely said to the Sadducees: in your scepticism about the future life you are making a big mistake because you do not sufficiently acknowledge the awesome power of God.

3. But Jesus has yet a third thing to say. There was more at stake here than either the over-estimating of our own human powers to lay down the limits of the possible and the impossible, or our under-estimating of the power of God to do far more than our finite minds can readily calculate

with our puny little slide rules. What is at stake in this entire issue, according to Jesus, is God's character. Those who deny a future life, Jesus asserts, are really blackening the face of God. And so He exclaims: God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. Now with that word of Jesus we are brought face to face with an ultimate 'either—or', from which there is no escape. Unless we are to go through our days without ever once seriously thinking about life, we have got to come down on one side of this fence or the other. For either God, the Power responsible for Creation, is the God of the dead or He is not—and in that 'not' what tremendous and ineffable glories must be hidden.

F. W. Norwood, a former minister of The City Temple in London, once put this matter in a way which for me is final. 'Say that God is the God of the dead. Then this millionfold universe, through illimitable ages is accomplishing nothing—nothing but death. These two thousand millions of living people who we say inhabit the world to-day are merely like a thin film of green moss over a bottomless bog of death. With every passing century the proportion of life to death grows less significant till the product is as nothing in comparison to the process. If in the face of a vision like this you can still tolerate the idea of God, at least say He is the symbol of the most appalling futility imaginable—the Projector of a squalid charnel house—the God of the dead.

'Or say that God is the God of the living, Creation itself being the impartation of His life, material worlds the expression of His will, from whom life pulses like a timeless sea; to the lowliest of living things being given the partial immortality of reproduction and to the higher the possibility of ascending fellowship, without stint, without boundary, in worlds upon worlds, through age after age.'

Before this sublime saying of Jesus, 'God is not the God of the dead but of the living', we must either deny God in any worshipful sense altogether, or we know what He is not—and know what He is.

And that for the Christian is really the heart of the matter. Our faith does not depend upon the kind permission of physicists or psychologists. It does not depend upon the fertility of our imagination to conceive how this or that or the other can be; for at a thousand points the imagination is baffled; even in earthly things it is a feeble light; the lens of the habitual and familiar clouds it sadly.

No—it is ultimately a question solely of the character of God in whom we believe and trust. If we are resting in Him now that is enough. If He is in truth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—how can there seriously be any further doubt or question?

A La Carte [1]

A Sermon for Young People

'Mary has chosen the best dish, and she is not to be dragged away from it.'—Lk 10[42] (Moffatt).

Very little imagination is needed to entertain your friends in a public restaurant, when the waiter presents you with a table d'hôte menu; you just sit back and patiently accept whatever is set in front of you. That is one way of going through life. But it is quite another matter, when the waiter with a sweep of the arm distributes to your guests a huge great menu card covered with strange hieroglyphics and with the names of the dishes in unpronounceable French, from which you must make your selection. You obviously cannot have everything, even if you could afford it, and so a careful selection has to be made. That is the other way of going through life.

Dr. Moffatt translates our Lord's commendation of Mary, in St. Luke's well-known incident, by the phrase, 'Mary has chosen the best dish, and she is not to be dragged away from it'. In a footnote he writes, 'I translate *merida* by "dish" to bring out the point and play of the saying. Jesus means that Mary has chosen well in selecting the nourishment of His teaching.' Martha, in the scene, has been fussing over supper and trying to prepare a great many different dishes: Mary has made her own deliberate selection. She wants fellowship with Jesus to be the main course of her life.

A familiar prayer asks God to 'save from all false choices', but the lives of so many to-day are endangered not so much by false choices as by the failure to make any deliberate choice at all from life's quite bewildering menu. And God means life to be *à la carte*. A rich profusion is lavishly offered to us, and if our lives are to have any nobility or coherent meaning we must ourselves make the choice. The table d'hôte arrangement is of course so much easier. But it never grows a character, for character only grows through personal choice of belief and behaviour.

How much, for example, hinges upon our *choice of a career*. In a world of increasing opportunity most young people can have a real choice and settle for themselves what they want to make of their lives. How are they setting about that momentous choice, which, once made, determines the future course of their destiny? Do we look down the menu and choose the most luscious food, the career which seems to offer rich prizes of easy money for very little effort? That is a common way of settling the matter in our crazy society

[1] John H. Withers, *Speak for Yourself*, 43. This is a new book and is reviewed under 'Literature'.—*Editor.*

which offers a pittance to an over-worked nurse and wraps a film-star in mink and jewels. Or, we may make our selection of a career by studying the occupations which offer the greatest security or the most prestige.

Gerald Moore was once given this advice by Sir Landon Ronald, the Principal of the Guildhall School of Music, ' The world is over-stocked with brilliant solo pianists, but there are precious few good accompanists in the field '. He found satisfaction in this lesser rôle. Perhaps some young man of high Christian ideals is still in doubt about his vocation. Has he considered the full-time ministry of the Christian Church ? It offers few monetary attractions ; but it does offer a task which ought to bring out the very best of a man's talents, as he commends by word and life the gospel of Jesus Christ to perishing men and women. This for him may well be ' the best dish '.

Deeper still, a young man must make his *choice of a set of values*. In the table d'hôte menu this is all arranged for you. You simply accept the standards of the folk around you, and make them the standards of your own life. This is not very exacting, for respectable social behaviour makes few demands. Within a few years of being completed, the Great Wall of China was breached on several occasions and a foreign invader entered that ancient land, not because the Wall was defective but because the sentries could be bribed. Society is only as strong as the moral fibre of the citizens. The fashionable morals of the present time applaud the man who ' diddles the income-tax ', cheats his firm in the matter of expenses and examines none too closely the main sources of his wealth.

The late Dr. C. E. M. Joad, in *The Book of Joad*, has a wonderful chapter on food, in which he tells of his experience in an English hotel after returning from a ' gastronomical holiday ' in France. ' Arrived in England we motored from Folkestone to London, and stopped at a fair-sized hotel in a small town. The waiter, a depressed-looking individual, approached and I asked what was for lunch. He seemed a little bewildered by the question, but finally said that there was soup. " Soup ! " said I. " Yes ", " but what kind of soup ? " The waiter looked more puzzled than ever. Presently he shrugged his shoulders and said, " Well, soup. Just soup." So with the fish. It was " Just Fish". At that sort of hotel all fish is the same, a slab of utterly tasteless white solid floating in a colourless liquid. Table d'hôte, indeed ! ' Surely it is not good enough to accept our moral standards in this way. The members of Moral Re-armament have given us a summary of Christ's moral appeal in their four absolutes—honesty, purity, unselfishness, love. We may quibble over their definition and assert that only love can be absolute. But here is one way of choosing a set of values for our lives. Steep yourself in the New Testament, and allow its high idealism to sink into your mind and imagination.

Come deeper still, and you discover that ultimately you have to make a *choice of an allegiance, a personal allegiance*. A friend once wrote to Turgenev, ' It seems to me that to put oneself in the second place is the whole significance of life '. The old prophet thundered to the people of his day, ' Choose ye this day whom ye will serve ; as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord '.

There are many levels of allegiance. The comedian could sing, ' I belong to Glasgow, dear old Glasgow town ', and in his sober moments that was a fine thing to confess, that he had a basic loyalty to the community of his birth. On the great occasion in London the multitudes will throng the area in front of Buckingham Palace and shout ' We want the Queen ', for a whole evening. And it is a fine thing when this faith in the symbol of British unity grips the hearts of a people. It is a larger area of allegiance.

No doubt much of this is a matter of the table d'hôte : the choice of allegiance was made by our parents and our national surroundings. But there is a deeper allegiance than this which must be first settled by any man or woman going out into the world. ' Whom will ye serve ? ' This involves the deepest loyalties of the mind and heart, the loyalties which guide us through all our other decisions. The Church offers you a Master who will really satisfy the yearnings of your spirit and guide you through the maze of the world with steady hand and assured knowledge. At the very beginning of your careers, before other voices clamour for your attention, you should listen to the voice of Christ as He pleads, ' Come unto me . . . Take my yoke upon you and learn of me '. If you take Him as your Lord and Saviour, like Mary you will have chosen the best dish, and nothing will ever be able to drag you away from it.

Entre Nous

Go, Preach, Heal the Sick

When Jesus Christ sent out His apostles His injunction to them was to go and to preach the Kingdom and to heal the sick. It may fitly be said that no modern apostle so fulfills that command as the medical missionary does. One of the greatest of modern medical missionaries is

Sir Henry Holland, and he has given us a thrilling and moving autobiography in *Frontier Doctor* (Hodder and Stoughton ; 25s. net).

Henry Holland was born in Durham, spent his early childhood in Riga on the Baltic, where his father was chaplain, and was brought up on the English side of the Border country. It was all unexpectedly that he gave his life to the service of Christ. In his last year at Loretto, without his knowledge, his parents enrolled him for the Public Schoolboys' Camp, where the claims of Christ were presented to senior schoolboys. Had he been asked if he wished to go he would certainly have refused. To use his own words, he shuddered when he heard the claims of Christ presented, and was determined that, however many surrendered, he would not succumb. As the evenings went on he felt more and more discomfort and uncertainty. 'Finally, on the last night', he says, 'I realized that this might be my last chance of making this great decision ; I gave myself to Jesus Christ'.

Henry Holland was anything but a pious phenomenon. 'To put it bluntly', he says, 'I decided to become a doctor in order to avoid going into the church.' So he proceeded to Edinburgh University. There he took a full interest in student Christian activities, but he had no idea of becoming a missionary. Then one evening he was at tea with two students who were going to China as medical missionaries. Above the mantelpiece were the words 'Not for ours only'. He asked what they meant and was reminded of the text : 'He is the propitiation for our sins ; and *not for ours only*, but also for the sins of the whole world'. Again he was 'unsettled and miserable', but Henry Holland was never the man to evade a challenge. He joined the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, and signed the declaration : 'It is my purpose, God willing, to become a foreign missionary'. In 1900 he was suddenly asked if he would go to Quetta—of which he had never heard—to the North-West Frontier of India, and to Quetta he went.

It looks like chance—or it looks like God. In Quetta his work became world famous, especially his work on eyes. The most famous eye clinic is in Shikarpur. Under his charge there have been carried out there a hundred and fifty thousand eye operations, eighty thousand of them for cataract. He has seen as many as two hundred and seventy patients in a day, and has done as many as seventy cataract operations in a day. His preaching has been by healing, and how amazingly effective it has been. He never forgot the words of Dr. Pennell : 'There is one door which only the doctor can unlock, and that is the door of the Frontiersman's heart'. Shikarpur was a closed city to which no foreigner or Christian was admitted. As Dr. Neve so graphically put it, Shikarpur was opened 'at the point of a cataract knife'. Amazing things happened. Patients came from long distances ; there were delays ; conditions were primitive ; but there were hundreds of cures. A grateful tribesman explained it all by saying : 'We've got you and God'.

It was this sheer *caring* which opened the door for Christ. Henry Holland's son wrote : 'Though we can speak in the tongue of the Afghan and the Baluch ; though we have the gift of the gab and can understand the working of the Sindhi mind ; though we have faith which can remove mountains of red tape ; it is nothing. Though we give our physical lives by driving them to the point of exhaustion ; and though we do hundreds of clever operations—and do not really *care* for the souls and bodies of those around us, we are nothing. That is why I was particularly happy when a Pakistani policeman on whose son we had done several plastic operations brought a cake for us at Christmas with one word on it—" Care ".'

Henry Holland was in Quetta when the terrible earthquake smote it in May 1953. It would be impossible to tell of the magnificence of the work done then. Out of the wreckage three British soldiers at the risk of their lives dug a Hindu and carried him tenderly to a hospital. In the hospital bed the dying Hindu said : 'I was taken out of the city by three Christian soldiers who lifted me with the greatest care and gentleness. I demand the faith which prompted that kind action.' And he was baptized before he died.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Professor Cullmann

The publishers of *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* (Dr. Vincent Taylor's article in the February number) are J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Sieback), Tübingen, and the price is DM 21.

Hungarian Pastor

If any reader is willing to send his copy of this Journal to a Pastor of the Hungarian Reformed Church this would be very much appreciated by him. If the offer is made to this Office his name and address will be forwarded.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.